

**No. 10450**

---

**United States  
Circuit Court of Appeals**

**For the Ninth Circuit.**

**HARRY BRIDGES,**

**Appellant,**

**vs.**

**I. F. WIXON, as District Director, Immigration  
and Naturalization Service, Department of  
Justice,**

**Appellee.**

**Transcript of Record**

**VOLUME XIII**

**Pages 5755 to 6250**

**Upon Appeal from the District Court of the United States  
for the Northern District of California,  
Northern Division**

After Recess

2:00 o'clock P.M.

Presiding Inspector: You may proceed, Mr. Grossman.

HARRY RENTON BRIDGES

called as a witness in his own behalf, having been previously duly sworn, testified further as follows:

Direct Examination (Resumed)

Mr. Grossman: Will you read the last question and answer, please?

(The question and answer referred to were read by the reporter as recorded.)

By Mr. Grossman:

Q. Can you give me one or two examples of the open statements in the ILA meeting of the activities of the Albion Hall group?

A. Some time after the group was functioning, and bringing up certain matters, they were criticized by individuals on the floor who raised the question as to what right they had to meet and come into the union with a program, and they were answered.

Q. How were they answered?

A. Well, they were answered by members of the group that got up and asked them what law there was against it, and if they wanted the minutes read on the floor of the meeting that the group would be only too glad to do it. I can recall [5372] the time that I did that myself.

Q. This Albion Hall group kept minutes, did it?



(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

A. It kept minutes; yes.

Q. About how often did it meet?

A. I can't quite recall. I think at first it met every week or two weeks; later on every two or three weeks.

Presiding Inspector: How often did the union itself meet?

The Witness: Every two weeks.

That reminds me—I think when the union was meeting every two weeks we met every two weeks. When the union met at shorter intervals I think we met at shorter intervals.

Presiding Inspector: You about synchronized them?

The Witness: Right. We always arranged for a meeting for the day before the union meeting so we could go into the union with a certain program to aim at.

By Mr. Grossman:

Q. How did one become a member of the Albion Hall group?

A. By just stopping him on the waterfront and asking if he would like to attend the meeting, and telling him where it was. [5373]

Q. What qualifications were there for membership and participation in the group?

Mr. Del Guercio: Will you speak a little louder, please?

By Mr. Grossman:

Q. What qualifications were there for membership or participation in the group?

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

A. First, you had to be a member of the Union; second, you had to be a working longshoreman; and, third, you had to believe in the policies of the group.

Q. Could you state those policies briefly?

A. Yes. Policies for, first, democratic organizations, such as the policy we put forward at that time, that elections must be by a vote of the membership; all members of the Union Executive Committee must be working longshoremen, exclusive of the elected officials; all Executive Board decisions must be ratified by the general membership; all minutes must be kept in writing; all funds must be regularly accounted for by reports to the Union meetings; all funds must be approved before—or, all bills must be approved before being paid. Such things as that. And, finally, that we had to support a program for various demands on behalf of the workers, such as a cessation of the speed-up, the establishment of a hiring hall, the distribution of the work, the wage-hour demands, and so forth. There was a general program. [5374]

Q. Did the Albion Hall group take any position on a Union question that necessarily involved other parts of the Pacific Coast? A. Yes.

Q. What was that action?

A. There had been a convention. In the latter part of 1933 Code hearings were held at Washington, D. C. That was the time that they were trying to establish Codes for various industries. Code hearings were held in Washington, D. C. and we

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

sent a representative back there—our Union did, Mr. H. P. Mechnikow. At the same time the Company Union was represented back there, and as an outcome of these Code hearings a Pacific Coast Conference of our Coast Union was called, that is, representatives supposedly from the various other Locals of our Union up and down the Pacific Coast, was called in Portland and a Union program was arrived at there generally aimed at going along with the Code and the wages and conditions established under the Code and the grievance-settling machinery established under the Code.

It amounted at that time to, instead of doing something about the workers' demands, they were going to be put to arbitration and, in addition, there was something very dangerous that we thought—minority representation was allowed for. Under the NRA minority groups of workers could be recognized for collective bargaining purposes and, therefore, [5375] both the Company Union and our Union could have been recognized by the employers for bargaining purposes, whether they represented the majority or a minority of the workers. And this, in effect,—

Mr. Del Guercio: (Interposing) If your Honor please, this is an exposition of something else now and hasn't anything to do with the 1934 strike.

Presiding Inspector: I think it is merely explanatory. I think I will take it.

Mr. Del Guercio: The answer could be a little more shorter.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Presiding Inspector: Well, that is a suggestion to Mr. Bridges.

The Witness: I can shorten them, your Honor.

Eventually, out of it, this convention was repudiated; another convention was called that had its growth in the Albion Hall group, who proposed it and brought it about.

By Mr. Grossman:

Q. How did they bring it about?

A. Passed a resolution in the Local, elected myself and another person to visit the various Locals on the Coast and have the membership in those Locals go on record as demanding a Coast convention with regularly elected delegates to establish a trade union program and to force bargaining with the employers. [5376]

Q. You mean that these things that the Locals subsequently did were first decided upon by the Albion Hall group?

A. They were. In many cases they were.

Q. I meant with reference to this convention, this coastwise convention? . . . A. That's right.

Q. Is it possible for you to state, Mr. Bridges, whether substantially all of the decisions of the Albion Hall group were accepted by the Local Union?

A. Practically all of them. I could look at the minutes and find out. I could check the minutes of the Albion Hall group with the minutes of the Local Union and come to a pretty complete con-

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

clusion on that. But, as far as I can recall, practically every action or peace program put forward by that group was approved by the membership in the Union. [5377]

Q. Were you ever connected with a publication called the Waterfront Worker? A. I was.

Q. Do you know how that publication came into existence?

A. Yes. There were two, two or three parts of it.

Q. Will you state, if you know, how it first came into existence, who was responsible for it?

A. The Marine Workers Industrial Union.

Q. Do you know about when it first came into existence? A. 1933, January.

Q. And what kind of a publication was it? First, was it printed or mimeographed?

A. Mimeographed bulletin. A mimeographed four-page bulletin, I think in its beginning, two or four pages in the beginning; later on six pages; and later on eight pages.

Q. What subjects did it deal with at first while it was put out by the Marine Workers Industrial Union?

A. I can't quite recall. It dealt with the general subject of organization of seamen and long-shoremen, their general complaints about conditions, the Company unionism on the waterfront, and also in addition certain political matters—I can't quite recall now.



(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Q. Did it deal primarily with conditions on the San Francisco waterfront? [5378]

A. Yes; as far as I can remember it did.

Q. Did you have anything to do with its publication at that time?

A. Not when it started.

Q. Can you give us an idea of how long after it started you first had something to do with it?

A. It started in January '33. We took it over in September or October '33.

Q. Whom do you mean by "we"?

A. Well, the Albion Hall group in some respects; and a pretty loose group of people on the waterfront, the way the paper was handled, not by any particular organized group, but everybody in a general way took it over.

Q. Was it first published, when it was published, by the NMU, by working longshoremen?

A. Well, in a way you could call them that. At that time there were certain docks on the waterfront mainly handling coastwise vessels where the crews of those vessels would come in and in between the trips they would work ashore maybe for a few days, a few weeks, and then they would do longshorework. We have a somewhat similar structure at present, but more so in those days. Therefore, these men, for a certain period of time, would be performing longshore work and, really speaking, longshoremen. But next week, or the next couple of weeks, they would be at sea again. They were not permanent resident longshoremen of the port.

[5379]

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Q. Do you know whether any of the resident longshoremen worked on the Waterfront Worker before you took it over?

A. I can't quite remember. My impression is if they did, they were very few. I remember that was a subject of discussion on the Waterfront at that time, where we believed, at least I can recall my impression was that very few of them did.

Q. Was the ILA also in existence at the time you took over the Waterfront Worker? A. Yes.

Q. Do you recall whether any change was made in describing those who were putting out the paper after you took it over?

A. Yes. We changed the name of the people putting out the paper to a group of ILA longshoremen.

Q. A group of what?

A. ILA longshoremen. Before the paper used to be put out by the MWIU. I think it carried that name on the masthead, or a group of longshoremen with the cooperation of the MWIU. I noticed one of the earlier issues since I have been in this trial, and I noticed that on the masthead. We took it over after that.

Q. How much of the old publication did you take over. Let me itemize the various things you might have taken over. Did you take over the name?

A. Took over the name. [5380]

Q. Did you take over a mimeograph machine?

Mr. Myron: I think he should be allowed to state what they took over.

(Testimony of Harry. Renton Bridges.)

Mr. Grossman: That is quite the reverse of your objection previously made.

Presiding Inspector: I think it may expedite it.

Mr. Grossman: Mr. Bridges may think of something that I would not.

Mr. Myron: It is leading.

Presiding Inspector: It is leading.

Mr. Del Guercio: It is leading on a question that is very important here.

Mr. Grossman: All right, I will ask it the other way round, to show I have no axes to grind here.

By Mr. Grossman:

Q. What did you take over of the Waterfront Worker when you took it over?

A. We took over the paper, the name, the general make-up and the general idea.

Q. Did you take over anything else?

A. Well, I don't know what else it could be.

Presiding Inspector: Mimeograph machine?

The Witness: No, we rented our own.

By Mr. Grossman:

Q. The address? [5381]

A. Well, yes, we took over the address for a while.

Q. Did you take over any supply of paper or ink?

A. No. They had none. The paper went out of business. As I recall it, the paper was out of business for three or four months and that is where

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

we got the idea to revive it because it was not being published any more.

Q. Do you remember whether any discussion was had with the MWIU about your beginning to put out the paper?

A. I discussed it myself with Harry Jackson of the MWIU.

Q. Will you give me the substance of any discussion, or discussions, you had with him about it?

A. The paper was being published at that time, and it was not finding a great deal of favor among the various regular longshoremen and—

Mr. Myron (Interposing): The question asked was what was discussed. The answer is not responsive.

Presiding Inspector: No.

A. (Continuing): All right. We discussed the fact that the paper was not a success because, in our opinion, who knew quite a bit about the background of the whole waterfront, it was not being put out by people who knew what the real grievances were of the longshoremen, and what should be done about them. We discussed that and pointed out that if this paper was published by men that really knew what they were talking [5382] about, it would be a very successful organ in more ways than one. We never found much agreement with the MWIU on that and, as we predicted, the paper folded up until we re-started it.

By Mr. Grossman:

Q. Did the contents of the paper change sub-

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

stantially after you took it over? First, let me put it this way:—

Mr. Del Guercio (Interposing): There is a question, if your Honor please, and I think the witness should be permitted to answer that question.

Presiding Inspector: If he can answer.

Mr. Grossman: I will make it smaller.

By Mr. Grossman:

Q. Did it change in subject matter?

A. That would be pretty hard to answer, unless I had a file of the copies and went through them. It changed in so far as, for example, a definite program began to take place. There was definite suggestions in there as to what to do, which was lacking when the paper was put out by the MWIU, who generally put forth a program in generalities.

Mr. Myron: The question is, "Did it change?" The answer is not responsive to the question.

Presiding Inspector: It is explanatory, but I think it answers it.

By Mr. Grossman: [5383]

Q. Continue.

A. I would say that was the basic change.

Q. Did it change with respect to who wrote the articles?

A. Not entirely. There were articles written by the longshoremen on the waterfront in the first paper, I think; but the articles were not actually written and mailed in by the longshoremen. They



(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

were given to the people who put the paper out at that time. In other words, the paper operated in a way like a regular newspaper does; that is, a group of men were going up and down the waterfront in the way of reporters and they talked to the men and got any stories they had and they appeared in the paper. [5384]

Q. This was before you took it over?

A. Before we took it over, yes.

Q. And after you took it over how were articles given to the paper?

A. The same way, except mainly we requested that articles be written and sent in and contributions also. But at the same time any little bit of news that, the type of news we wanted at that time, we could dig up ourselves we wrote it down and put it in. The paper was made up of stories given in and written in and printed just as they came in.

Q. Were there a group of longshoremen who more or less regularly did some work in connection with the paper?

A. There was.

Q. This is after you took it over?

A. Yes.

Q. About how many would you say there were on the average?

A. All the way from about ten to thirty.

Q. If you took various periods in the history of the paper would the composition of this group change? Would there be different people in this group that had to do with putting out the paper?

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

A. Yes, I think so. I think some of the fellows would be interested in it for two or three weeks, and then they would drop away from an active part. But they would help out in other ways. And it generally boiled down to the actual getting [5385] out of the paper had to be done by eight or ten people as far as any active work was concerned, seeing that enough articles got in to fill it up and seeing that the mimeographing of it was taken care of and seeing that the peddling of it was taken care of.

Q. By whom was the paper distributed?

A. By seamen; that is, seamen that we hired. I think we gave them 50 cents a day to come down and peddle the paper on the waterfront.

Q. Was that true during the entire existence of the paper after you took it over? A. Yes.

Q. How long did the paper remain in existence?

A. Until some time in 1936.

Q. What was the reason you took the paper over?

A. First of all, it had gone out of business; it was not being published. That didn't cause any great stir in itself except a situation developed on the waterfront at that time where we needed some kind of a medium to rally people. That was the time of the October, 1933 Matson strike. And we needed some, either leaflets or something like that to explain to the men on the waterfront what was happening and in order to explain to other people, and we seized upon the idea to use the Waterfront

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Worker, the reason for it being that they started to recruit strike breakers from the Skid Row on Howard Street amongst the unemployed. The Waterfront Worker of the Marine [5386] Workers Industrial Union had been circulated amongst the unemployed and it had a little more standing up there than it did down amongst us men on the waterfront. So we hit upon the idea of using the name "Waterfront Worker" and we issued a couple of leaflets during that strike headed "Waterfront Worker", mainly for circulation amongst the unemployed, urging them not to strike break. And the rest of it grew from that.

Q. Was the paper put out of existence or did it—well, I will put it this way: Did you take any active steps to put the paper out of existence?

A. When it finally went out of existence, yes.

Q. Why did you do this?

A. No necessity for the paper any longer. We had a democratic union where you didn't have to go to the methods—you didn't have to use those methods to express yourself. You could get up in the union and express yourself and be protected in expressing your opinion. Therefore, to keep an organ like that going was not democratic any more, not necessary.

Q. Was it needed, though, for that reason prior to that time?

A. It certainly was, in our opinion. And I think it eventually proved it.

Q. Was it impossible to express yourself as fully:

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

in the Union meeting in 1933 and 1934 as you could in a paper like the Waterfront Worker? [5387]

A. Well, I wouldn't—in 1934, even during the strike and after the strike, yes. It was possible to express yourself in the Union meetings, but it was still not possible to say a lot of other things because the Union wasn't strong enough to protect you. It is one thing talking in a Union meeting and it is one thing standing up for your rights so far as Union conditions were concerned while you were working. The employers had a pretty tough hold down there and, although we were not asking for anything unreasonable or out of the ordinary, why, they refused to recognize the Union, refused to even talk to the Union and to talk Union or to ask for anything was tantamount to being fired immediately.

Q. You mean, then, that even after the 1934 strike the Union was not able to fully protect members of the Union against discrimination by the employers?

Mr. Myron: I object to that, your Honor. He is asking the witness if he means something and he already stated what he knows.

Presiding Inspector: Well, I suppose it is strictly objectionable on that ground.

Mr. Grossman: For the purpose of clarity I think I have a right to say what I think is the interpretation to see if that is correct.

Presiding Inspector: Well, I think that really it doesn't need any interpretation. His answer is clear, isn't it? [5388]

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Mr. Grossman: All right.

Presiding Inspector: It is a technical objection.

By Mr. Grossman:

Q. Did the Waterfront Worker after you took it over support itself?

A. Yes. Right from the start it supported itself. Well, not right from the start. We all had to put in a few dollars to get the thing started and it never did—well, towards the end we had a few dollars in the fund, but it was touch and go. But it was always self-supporting. We raised the price from one cent to two cents shortly after we went into business, and eventually became pretty self-supporting; even showed a slight profit.

Q. What was the maximum circulation achieved by the paper?

A. Four or five thousand; not only in the Port of San Francisco. Later on we mailed some to other ports upon request.

Q. Could you estimate what proportion of the longshoremen in the Port of San Francisco were reading this paper at the time of its maximum circulation?

A. All of them and their families.

Mr. Del Guercio: I object to that.

Presiding Inspector: Could he show that? Would he know? [5389]

Mr. Grossman: Why, certainly.

Presiding Inspector: How many workers were there on the waterfront?

The Witness: At that time around four thousand.



(Testimony of Harry Renton-Bridges.)

Presiding Inspector: No, no; the whole Western Coast.

The Witness: Oh, longshoremen alone about twelve or thirteen thousand.

Presiding Inspector: And what was the circulation of your newspaper?

The Witness: About five thousand.

Presiding Inspector: Was that all over the Coast?

The Witness: That's right. But that means that out of the five thousand there might be five or six hundred mailed out of San Francisco. We wouldn't mail them in big orders.

Presiding Inspector: No.

The Witness: No. The bulk of the papers were sold on the San Francisco Waterfront generally between three and four thousand a week.

Presiding Inspector: If you want to ask it you may.

By Mr. Grossman:

Q. Can you estimate what proportion of the working longshoremen in San Francisco were readers of this paper at the time of its maximum circulation?

A. The answer is, All of them. Even the ones that didn't like it read it. [5390]

Mr. Myron: I assume he knows that.

The Witness: I am positive of it.

Mr. Grossman: I suggest that the Chronicle, if it can estimate things like that, the Waterfront Worker can.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Mr. Del Guercio: Are you testifying?

Mr. Gladstein: May I suggest that counsel be required to address objections to the Court instead of back across the table, your Honor?

Presiding Inspector: I don't think that either of you are wholly free from blame in that respect.

Mr. Gladstein: Wouldn't it be a good idea to try to start it sometime?

Presiding Inspector: I have tried to. I think I must have said so 50 times in these weeks. It seems to me very long now.

Mr. Gladstein: What will the ruling of the Court be?

Presiding Inspector: The ruling is that you must address the Examiner. I mean, this particular Examiner.

Mr. Grossman: That is rather a change.

By Mr. Grossman:

Q. Did the Editors of the paper continue to function during its life more or less anonymously?

A. Yes.

Q. During the time that you were putting out the paper did you receive any help in any form from the Marine Workers [5391] Industrial Union?

A. It all depends on how you define "help." Information for the paper or stories for the paper, yes. Other help no. Financial help, no; mechanical help, no.

Q. Do you know how the mailing address for

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

the Waterfront Worker was selected at any time when you had anything to do with it?

A. Yes. As far as I can recall, we—

Q. (Interposing) Will you state what you remember about that.

A. I didn't personally arrange it. I knew of it. We had Jackson arrange for a mailing address. We didn't want to be connected with it, mainly because of our fear of discrimination on the waterfront. That was the only reason. And the mailing address was arranged for merely to receive mail and contributions that we requested by mail, and they were picked up by one of the seamen that we used to hire and turned over to us.

Q. When your mailing address was 3470 19th Street did any of the editors of the paper ever go to that address to pick up the mail, money or whatever had been sent to it?

A. No. Logically not. The place was watched.

Q. When the mailing address was a certain Post Office box do you know whether any of those connected with the paper—rather, any of the working longshoremen went there to receive the mail or the money or whatever else may have been sent to [5392] the paper?

A. I am sure they didn't. That's the idea of having the mailing address. We knew that the employers on the waterfront were trying to find out who was connected with that paper. They had some very deep suspicions, but nothing concrete, and it was more than any of our jobs were worth or even

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

our physical safety for a long time to be found or definitely shown to be behind the paper.

Mr. Del Guercio: I assume he is still speaking from his own knowledge.

The Witness: Definitely from my own knowledge. Very definitely. We had a Company Union down there and there were a good bunch of slug-gers and I got slugged a couple of times by them.

By Mr. Grossman:

Q. Did you know at the time the Waterfront Worker was using the mailing address 3470 - 19th Street what that place is, or in whose name it was rented or owned?

A. I didn't know and didn't care much.

Q. At the time that the Waterfront Worker was using a Post Office Box for its mailing address did you know in whose name or by whom that Post Office box had been obtained?

A. No. I didn't know in whose name. I know that we got somebody that was pretty hard to be discriminated against inasmuch as he was not a working longshoreman. [5393] We generally aimed at getting somebody that didn't have to depend on the waterfront as a working longshoreman for a livelihood, somebody that had some other avenue of escape. That was the only idea we had in mind. We possibly didn't inquire too much into their connections or their record.

Q. Can you tell me how the 1934 strike developed? What was the first Union action that precipitated or caused the strike?

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Mr. Del Guercio: Your Honor, hasn't that been gone over, what brought about the 1934 strike? I thought we went all over that.

Mr. Grossman: All I went up to was the economic and working conditions on the waterfront. I wasn't concerned with the strike itself, the Union, etc., which I am now asking for.

Presiding Inspector: I think this is very remote, but I will take it.

A. As an outcome of the resolution passed in the San Francisco Longshore Local and the delegation that consisted of another person and myself visiting the other ports, a coast convention was called in San Francisco in February, 1934 and that convention adopted the Union demands and set a deadline on which they would take a strike vote if those demands were not granted. The deadline came and passed and a strike vote was taken. The strike was postponed at the request of President Roosevelt and a Mediation Board was established. They reached a compromise agreement that was repudiated by the Coast and [5394] eventually on May the 9th the strike was called as a result of that convention and by the coast officers at that time.

Presiding Inspector: I don't quite understand the terminology. What do you mean by "the coast"?

The Witness: The structure of our Union, your Honor; the Union at that time.

Presiding Inspector: You mean all of the Unions which were in communication with you?



(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

The Witness: It was all one Union except that it was divided into Locals.

Presiding Inspector: Different locals?

The Witness: Yes, and the jurisdiction broadly—

Presiding Inspector: (Interposing) That is what you call "the coast"?

The Witness: When I say "the coast" I mean the Pacific Coast between the borders of Mexico and Canada in this particular instance.

By Mr. Grossman:

Q. Was there not at that time a division of the International Union confined to the Pacific Coast called "The Pacific Coast District"?

A. That is right.

Q. With officers of its own?

A. That's right. An autonomous district.

Q. With a measure of autonomy?

A. That's right. [5395]

Q. Was action to call the strike taken by that district organization?

A. By the district organization through a referendum vote.

Q. Were there by this time locals in various ports on the Pacific Coast?

A. In all of them; practically all of them. That's incorrect. There was no local in Eureka, Crescent City, Fort Bragg.

Q. All the major ports?

A. All the major ports; yes, sir.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Presiding Inspector: Now, you said back there a compromise was suggested.

The Witness: That's right.

Presiding Inspector: Who were the ones who proposed the compromise?

The Witness: A Mediation Board established under the National Recovery Act at that time having in it, as I said, this business of allowing minority representation and calling for a vote with the exception of one port. The compromise agreement reached granted our demands in San Francisco up to some extent. For all the other ports they ruled that the men would have to start voting to see if the Union really represented them, and that proposal was proposed by the Mediation Board and rejected by the Coast longshoremen at our in- [5396] sistence for a program that, the best way to find out whether we represented the men or not was to stop the ships from running, and also the best way to kill off this minority representation that had the nature of a Company Union in each port was to do the same thing and demand a bona fide contract with proper recognition.

By Mr. Grossman:

Q. Why did you object at that time to minority representation?

A. Because obviously it would have destroyed our Union. We would have gotten nowhere in negotiations and it was the Company Union set-up all over again except instead of just having it confined

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

to San Francisco it would have been a coast-wise Company Union.

Q. What was the date that the ILA went on strike on a coastwise basis?

A. May 9, 1934.

Q. During that same day did any other union go out on strike? A. No.

Q. What was the next union to go out on strike?

A. Marine Workers Industrial Union.

Q. Did they go out on a coast scale or in every port of the Pacific Coast?

A. May 10, yes. [5397]

Q. And whom did they represent?

A. The majority of the seamen at that time organized into a trade union on the Pacific Coast.

Q. You mean a majority of the seamen that belonged to any union whatsoever?

○ A. Well, there were—

Q. (Interposing) Or a majority of those who were working as seamen?

A. It represented a number of working seamen in a union. There were two unions. I think the best way to explain it is that there were two unions all right. There was the International Seamen's Union of America and there was the Marine Workers Industrial Union. The International Seamen's Union of America at that time had around four or five hundred members all told. The M. W. I. U. had 2000 generally speaking. Therefore, they represented the majority of organized seamen, those that were in unions at all. [5398]

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Q. Did the International Seamen's Union come out on strike?

A. May 15, under a lot of pressure.

Q. What kind of pressure?

A. First of all, they were locked out of the coastwise ships that suspended operations on May 12. They couldn't stay on the job. They tried to get them to get off. Others on deep water ships they were kept off to some degree by picket lines. In addition, through the propaganda and other things we carried on, many of them came off of their own accord through shame and other reasons; and many of them, of course, to support our strike as workers in the union.

However, the union, the teamsters union all this time were urging them to stay aboard the ships, urging them to have nothing to do with our strike, urging them on as strike breakers.

Eventually, a meeting was called that only consisted of 27 men in San Francisco of the Seamen's Union and that meeting voted the Pacific Coast strike for the Seamen May 15 by a vote of around 15 to 12.

Q. When the Marine Workers Industrial Union went out on strike did most of their men immediately come out on strike?

A. No. The Marine Workers Industrial Union sent a delegation over before our Longshore Strike Committee, and they had a list of ships that they had organized in varying degrees. [5399] They had a couple of ships, I think the number was two,

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

where they had 100 per cent organization on them; and they had half a dozen or so where they had, say 75 or 80 per cent organization, dwindling all the way down to where they had five or ten per cent organization. They showed us the list of ships as to what number they had organized; and the question was should they order all their men off these ships, or should they not. We eventually agreed on a joint program with our Strike Committee, and the delegates from the MWIU that were down there putting all this problem up to us, we agreed that they should call off their crews on all ships where they had a majority of the crew organized, and on those ships where they had less than a majority organized, they should stay aboard for the time being to see if they could make the crew of the ship a majority in the union and as soon as that was done they were to call them off too.

Q. Immediately after your union went on strike did you set up any kind of a strike apparatus?

A. We set it up two months before.

Q. What was that apparatus?

A. A local strike Committee of 75 men, representing two men elected from each dock, and five men to represent the men at large, not regularly working on any particular dock—75 all told. In addition to that the Executive Board of the Union which, I think, consisted of 25 men, making a committee of— [5400] no. I think, all told it was 75 men; around 50 from the docks and the Executive Board of 25.



(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Q. Did you hold any position on this Strike Committee? A. I was elected Chairman.

Q. At what time? A. March, 1934.

Presiding Inspector: That is of the Strike Committee?

The Witness: Chairman of the Strike Committee; yes.

By Mr. Grossman:

Q. For how long did you function as Chairman of the Strike Committee?

A. Until the end of the strike.

Q. Did the Strike Committee of your local union cooperate in any way with the Marine Workers Industrial Union? A. It did.

Q. In what ways did it cooperate?

A. Helped them establish the picket lines—in other words, the establishment of picket lines was a joint matter; to some degree we collaborated in helping them feed their striking men; they were supplied with picket cards, or not picket cards, but they were allowed to use their picket cards to eat in the soup kitchen that we established, and they worked in some cases under the direction of our Picket Captain, or our Picketing Committee; and we collaborated on the use of squad cars, and such things as that. For a while they had a [5401] regular delegation, and they were not seated, they were seated as observers on our local Strike Committee, a delegation from the MWIU.

Q. What are squad cars?

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

A. Squad cars were just patrol cars used to patrol the waterfront with pickets in them, to watch for the movement of ships and one thing and another; generally what you might call patrols as distinguished from the stationary pickets that picketed outside of each dock.

Presiding Inspector: How many pickets did you have at one time?

The Witness: It depended. We had 20,000 one day.

Presiding Inspector: I mean on the waterfront serving as pickets.

The Witness: It grew. At the very start we possibly had turned out 1000 for the first couple of days.

Presiding Inspector: That is for the whole waterfront?

The Witness: Yes. That number grew and grew as the seamen came ashore and other workers walked out in our support; that number grew until it reached on one occasion 20,000.

Presiding Inspector: Quite a show of force?

The Witness: Quite a show of men on strike.

Presiding Inspector: Oh, no. They weren't wandering all around the city. They were right there all together, weren't they? [5402]

The Witness: They were pickets, quite a large number.

Presiding Inspector: You know what is meant by "quite a show of force."

The Witness: You might term it that, but that wasn't our idea.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Presiding Inspector: Go ahead.

By Mr. Grossman:

Q. What did the Marine Workers Industrial Union do to cooperate with your local?

A. Picketed with our men, contributed in so far as they were able to the various funds, such as the funds that supported the soup kitchen, exchanged information with us; in other words, if they had information of a ship coming in, going to the dock, and the possibilities of the crew striking—things like that—collaborating in the operation of—we had three picket boats. We had one speed launch and two other launches. They cooperated in the operation of those launches. And certain things like that.

Presiding Inspector: How long is the waterfront here?

The Witness: Oh, the waterfront here is about five miles, at least, on this side; and then it is much longer over on the other side, that is, the east bay side. It extends up the river. We were patrolling the whole area, you might call it, the San Francisco Bay area really. It goes up the river, the Sacramento River, as far as Stockton, Crockett, Vallejo; and down the peninsula as far as Redwood City. This was the [5403] broad area covered. That might be an area of at least 50 square miles or more.

Presiding Inspector: You concentrated, though, principally on the five or ten miles, along in there?

The Witness: We concentrated mainly on the five or ten miles on this side, and the five or ten miles on the other side of the bay.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Presiding Inspector: I am not familiar with the locale.

By Mr. Grossman:

Q. When the Marine Workers Industrial Union called their men out on strike did they have any demands of their own, that is, for the seamen?

A. No, the seamen had no demands of any description until much later.

Q. Would you state that the sole reason for the Marine Workers Industrial Union calling out its members on strike at the beginning was in sympathy, in support of the longshoremen and their demands?

Mr. Del Guercio: I object to the question as putting words in the mouth of the witness.

Presiding Inspector: I will take it.

Mr. Del Guercio: Not that the witness would fall for it, but—

Mr. Grossman (Interposing): On a question like this I can't force Mr. Bridges to say something he hasn't said many times before. [5404]

Presiding Inspector: I will take it.

Mr. Del Guercio: I would like—

Presiding Inspector: I have said twice that I will take it.

A. Yes.

Presiding Inspector: Over your objection.

A. (Continuing): Yes. It is a matter of record, as a matter of fact. A delegation at our 1934 February convention, a delegation from the Marine Work-

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

ers Industrial Union, came to the convention and pledged full support to our securing a contract, and their strike was in the beginning purely a sympathetic strike.

By Mr. Grossman:

Q. What was the next union, after the MWIU, which came out on strike?

A. The Machinists Union.

Q. When did they come out on strike?

A. Around May 12.

Q. What was the next?

A. The Boilermakers, the same day. When I say, "strike," I mean they refused to work on the waterfront any struck work, refused to perform any repair work on the waterfront behind picket lines. They worked elsewhere in the city.

Q. When was the next union?

A. The seamen, May 15.

Q. When did the other seafaring unions come out on strike? [5405]

A. The Teamsters May 23—May 20 or 23, around there.

Following then, about ten days, or around the beginning of June 1st, or June 5th, I think it was, the licensed groups struck, that is the licensed deck and engine room officers.

Just prior to that time the licensed radio officers struck, that is, just prior to the licensed deck and engine room officers.

Q. Do you know whether the experience in San Francisco was typical of the coast with reference to



(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

when the Marine Workers Industrial Union called out their men and when the International Seamen's Union called out theirs?

A. The same up and down the coast.

Q. Do you know whether there was the same co-operation between the longshoremen and the MWIU in other of the major ports of the Pacific Coast as in San Francisco?

Mr. Myron: Is that material, your Honor?

Presiding Inspector: I don't think it is very material.

Mr. Myron: Unless it is to show he had something to do with the Marine Workers Industrial Union in other ports.

Mr. Grossman: I will explain it if there is any question about it.

Presiding Inspector: I will take it. I will take all of this testimony. I think it is rather remote.

Mr. Grossman: May I say it is with reference to explaining the clear significance of it. The Government has definitely stated, in their opening statement, that one of the theories upon which they would seek to deport Mr. Bridges is the theory [5406] that he was affiliated with the Marine Workers Industrial Union. Then they went farther. They gave what they claim should now be accepted as a definition of affiliation, as against the one now legally accepted by certain courts, which is very broad, as your Honor will recall, which would undoubtedly include the definition they are claiming, would be merely support, which would undoubtedly include, according to their theory, the acts which Mr. Bridges is now detailing.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

In other words, we want to show this: That in so far as Mr. Bridges was helping the Marine Workers Industrial Union, cooperating with them, or accepting their cooperation, it was, in the first place, acting not just as an individual, but acting as a representative of a union, and he was engaging in a legitimate union and strike activity, going so far, as a matter of fact, as I think the story will show, going so far—I mean their cooperation being so important—that it would be quite a reasonable conclusion that had there not been that cooperation at the beginning between the Marine Workers Industrial Union, a union, and the longshoremen, that the 1934 strike might not have succeeded.

Therefore, I intend to show that the cooperation, such as there was, between Mr. Bridges, as a representative of his own union, and the Marine Workers Industrial Union, was a part of the strike, not only in San Francisco, but on the entire Pacific Coast, and an integral part of the strike apparatus, [5407] the means by which the seamen, or the unlicensed seamen, entered and began to participate in the strike, at least at the very beginning.

That is the significance of it.

I do not think that is at all remote.

Mr. Del Guercio: I object to counsel arguing and expounding his theory of the case when he is about to ask these questions of the witness. It won't be necessary at all for the witness to testify.

Presiding Inspector: I think I will take it. I will take the full blame, if anyone is at fault. I

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

wanted to understand exactly the basis of it. Without in any way saying that I do or do not accept this argument, I will take the proof.

Mr. Grossman: Will you read the question, Mr. Reporter?

(The question referred to was read by the reporter as follows:

"Q. Do you know whether there was the same cooperation between the longshoremen and the MWIU in other of the major ports of the Pacific Coast as in San Francisco?")

A. Substantially, yes; there might have been more in some cases and less in others.

By Mr. Grossman:

Q. Do you know whether this is true: That in every major port of the Pacific Coast the Marine Workers Industrial Union had a larger membership at the beginning of the strike [5408] than the International Seamen's Union?

A. Absolutely; yes.

Q. You stated, Mr. Bridges, that your Strike Committee, in your local, was set up two months before the strike began. Was there any cooperation between that Strike Committee and the Marine Workers Industrial Union before the strike began?

A. No. The Strike Committee was disbanded. The strike was originally set for March 7th. It was postponed at the request of the President and referred to this Mediation Board. After the strike was postponed the Strike Committee was temporarily

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

disbanded and was not again established until the actual strike broke out. Prior to the strike there was no actual cooperation, although we were urging, as a general theme, that to win any strike and to strengthen our bargaining efforts, we had to get closer to the seamen because this was the first long-shore strike that has ever been won, really speaking; every other strike has been lost because the seamen were disregarded, except in this case.

Q. To what extent did the Marine Workers Industrial Union participate in any joint Strike Committees that were set up in San Francisco?

A. None; there was no other union, that is, of the same degree of strength as we. We were the only union that was contemplating striking, the only union at all organized, so really there was no other union to speak of to cooperate with to any degree.

[5409]

Q. Now, after the strike started wasn't there a joint Strike Committee, or several joint Committees of some kind?

A. Not until some time after the strike, except in the cases I have told you, the Machinists and the Boilermakers Union, which were unions of more or less long standing. All the other unions, the Maritime unions, had practically no membership until the strike had been on a couple of weeks and some of the men came ashore off the ships and they got some members.

Presiding Inspector: You did say something

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

about some people being allowed to attend your Strike Committee meetings?

The Witness: That was after the strike started. In other words, we had unions, you had the skeleton structure of unions, but no membership; and the largest membership in any seamen's union at that time was the Marine Workers Industrial Union. It is true that when the licensed group struck they said, they had 1000 men that went out, but it is true that they were lucky to have had 100.

By Mr. Grossman:

Q. Was there any change in the relative membership of the Marine Workers Industrial Union and the International Seamen's Union as the strike went on? A. Yes.

Q. What happened?

A. The *Marine Industrial Workers Union* rapidly grew in [5410] membership. The Seamen's Union, what there was of it, the membership almost completely left them.

Q. Was there any other change in the respective membership of these two unions?

A. Later on, toward, after the strike was about two-thirds through, because of certain things, most of the membership left the Marine Workers Industrial Union and went into the Seamen's Union.

Q. That was when?

A. I would say it was around the end of June, the beginning of July, of the strike—the strike started May 9th and ended July 31.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Q. What positions did you hold, what union positions during the 1934 strike?

A. A member of the Executive Committee of the Local, and Chairman of the Strike Committee. That is all.

Q. Were you on any other committees—were you on any sub-committees of the Strike Committee?

A. No. I was ex-officio member, or ex-officio Chairman, you might say, of all committees. I was ex-officio member of all committees. Later I was Chairman of the Joint Marine Strike Committee, later on in the strike.

Q. Can you estimate about when that Joint Marine Strike Committee was set up?

A. June 17, 1934.

Q. And who were included on that Joint Marine Strike [5411] Committee?

A. Fifty men; five from every union on strike.

Q. Was the Marine Workers Industrial Union participating in that Joint Marine Strike Committee?

A. Only in the beginning, the first couple of days. We established the Joint Strike Committee after an attempt was made to settle the strike. We called upon each union on strike to send a delegation of five men to form a Joint Marine Strike Committee. The Marine Workers Industrial Union responded, like other unions. A dispute came up over them being seated on the Strike Committee. It got into such a wrangle that eventually the Marine Workers Industrial Union, their delegation, got up and said "Sooner



(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

than have this go on in the middle of a strike, we are withdrawing, and we will continue all our support, we will continue to carry on the way we have been carrying on, we will trust you people to do the right thing and to give us a square deal."

So they were only seated for two days, or two meetings.

Our particular union was instructed by the membership to support their seating on the strike Committee. We were overruled by a majority vote on that Joint Marine Strike Committee.

Q. At any other time during the strike did you hold any position on a union, whether your own union or any other union committee?

A. Not that I can recall. [5412]

Q. Did you hold any position during the general strike on any union committee?

A. I was a member of the general Strike Executive Committee, as well as being a member of the General Strike Committee.

Q. You were a delegate to the San Francisco Central Labor Council during the strike?

A. Yes.

Q. Could you give us a picture of your typical day's activity during the 1934 strike?

Mr. Del Guercio: Now, your Honor, that is a little far-fetched,—daily activities.

Presiding Inspector: I don't think it makes any—I understand what you have in mind.

Mr. Grossman: I am referring to the testimony of Mr. Laurence.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Presiding Inspector: Yes.

Mr. Grossman: I think, your Honor—

Presiding Insepctor: His custom, if it was a custom, wouldn't make any difference.

Mr. Grossman: I want to know when the Committees met, and that sort of thing.

Presiding Inspector: Haven't we had that already?

Mr. Grossman: No.

Presiding Inspector: You can show when the Committees met.

By Mr. Grossman: [5413]

Q. Could you state what was your regular routine with reference to when the various committees that you attended, or the various meetings that you attended, were convened?

Presiding Insector: We don't care so much about his routine. We can take that up later, if necessary. Let us find out when the committees met.

By Mr. Grossman:

Q. When did the committees meet that you were participating in?

A. That depends on which one you want.

Q. Take them one by one.

A. The committees that generally met first, at eight o'clock in the morning—

Mr. Del Guercio (Interposing): Which committee?

A. (Continuing): The Picketing Committee met regularly every morning at eight o'clock mainly

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

for the purpose of assigning pickets, and working out the day's work on the picket lines, keeping track of all pickets to see that they were on the job, and so forth.

Following that we would have meetings of the other committees—Publicity, Defense—depending upon what activities were on for the day.

A regular daily meeting always was had by the Relief Committee, which was one of the more important committees.

Presiding Inspector: What time of day did that Committee meet? [5414]

The Witness: I can't recall. I know all those meetings generally occurred in the morning because regularly every afternoon the strike Committee as a whole met. Therefore, we set aside, because of the nature of the activities of those committees, first, and because that was the only time we had available, second, and these committees began to meet at eight o'clock in the morning.

By Mr. Grossman:

Q. How long did the meetings of the Strike Committee generally last?

A. All the way from one hour to three hours.

Q. Did you have any regular meeting to report to the membership?

A. Yes; very frequent ones.

Q. Would they be every day, every week, or what?

A. We had daily meetings; every day around ten o'clock, or maybe earlier, meetings following the

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Picketing Committee. Now, I recall we would have the Picketing Committee meet at eight o'clock in the morning, and as soon as the plans for the day were worked out, by that time all the pickets had congregated outside the union hall in a vacant lot across the street, and we would go out and get up on a stand and announce the day's plan of the Picketing Committee, to those who had just arrived, to all of those that were standing there, and they then dispersed to the various jobs and various places, after they had [5415] a general report of what had been arrived at, the status of negotiations, and certain other things.

[5416]

Q. Did you participate in the meetings of the Picketing Committee?

A. I participated in the meetings of all committees.

Q. Did you make a report every day to this meeting of the membership that was in the vacant lot across from the Union hall?

A. Every day.

Q. Were there any other meetings now that were held every day during the strike?

A. Meetings of the—you mean meetings of the committees?

Q. Any meetings that were held daily. Were there any others?

Presiding Inspector: Committees or sub-committees.

A. Well, we had meetings of the sub-committee, the Local Strike Committee, and the Joint Marine Strike Committee daily. That was after the Joint

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Marine Strike Committee was formed, and then these membership—brief membership meetings lasting about half an hour every day for reports.

Presiding Inspector: Defense?

The Witness: It depends. Certain committees like Publicity, Defense, Sick Committees and things like that, they didn't meet daily so much depending on the amount of activity. Sometimes they might have to meet three or four times a day depending upon the activities of the people. Sometimes they may slip a day or two. [5417]

By Mr. Grossman:

Q. Were there regular meetings of the Local Union?

A. There were regular meetings of the Local Union generally once or twice a week. Once a week as a rule.

Q. Were they in the evening or day time?

A. In the evening.

Q. Which day of the week, if there was a regular day?

A. It depends. We didn't have regular meetings at that time. We operated on the basis that we called meetings when it was necessary; that is, so we wouldn't be bound to any one particular day. Therefore, we might have two or three meetings a week. We might go all the next week with one meeting.

Q. Would you change your schedule any when the Joint Strike Committee began to function?

A. Not that I particularly recall.

Q. Did the Joint Strike Committee meet daily?



(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

A. Yes.

Q. Did your Local Strike Committee meet every day?

A. Every day.

Q. How often did the General Strike Committee meet?

A. Only for the period of the general strike every day, four days or about five days.

Q. Did it meet before the general strike?

A. Yes. I think one day before the general strike. At that time we were generally resolved—we were in a Committee of the whole, and then later on they elected out of the [5418] Committee of the Whole—they elected a Chairman, Vice-Chairman, Secretary and Assistant Secretary and an Executive Committee to act as General Executive Strike Committee. Otherwise what you might call it, the entire General Strike Committee was a Committee of the Whole consisting of five delegates from every Union in San Francisco.

Q. What was the smaller committee within the General Strike Committee?

A. The General Executive Strike Committee.

Q. How large was that?

A. I forget. I think it had—I think it had 15 or 20 members on it.

Q. You wouldn't be able to name most of those?

A. I think I would.

Q. Would you try?

A. Edward Vandeleur was Chairman; C. W. Diehl was Vice-Chairman; George Kidwell was Secretary; Jack Shelley was Assistant Secretary;



(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

John O'Connell was on there; Milton Maxwell of the Butchers was on there; I was on there; and the International Official of the Machinists Union, who is dead now, was on there. I can't recall his name. Charles Derry—Derry—I don't know what his first name is—of the Labor Journal was on there. A Mr. Desepte, if my recollection is correct, was also a member; that's about all I could recall off-hand. I could very easily check the records and [5419] get the entire committee.

Q. Was there any Governmental Commission or Committee functioning during the strike?

A. Board of Arbitration—a Board of Mediation at that time—it later became a Board of Arbitration—appointed by the President by a special Congressional resolution.

Q. And did you attend any meetings of that Committee during the strike?

A. Numerous ones.

Q. Was there any other Governmental Committee functioning during that strike?

A. Not that I recall. There was Government individuals laying all over the place, but not that I can recall specifically functioning as a committee.

Q. What was the function of this Governmental Committee that you described?

A. They were the regularly constituted Board of Mediation appointed by President Roosevelt as a result of a special resolution in Congress to attempt to mediate the dispute and to urge upon the parties arbitration.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Presiding Inspector: How large was the committee?

The Witness: A committee of three: Edward F. McGrady, at that time Assistant Secretary of Labor; Archbishop Hanna, who was Chairman; and Mr. O. K. Cushing. [5420]

By Mr. Grossman:

Q. Do you remember any other meetings, Union meetings that you attended during the strike?

A. So numerous that I could never remember them all. I attended a dozen a day. I attended as many as four or five at night.

Q. Did you ever have occasion to attend meetings of other Local Unions during the strike?

A. Almost every day and night.

Mr. Del Guercio: May we have a recess?

Mr. Grossman: Yes, we might as well have it now.

Presiding Inspector: We shall take a short recess.

Whereupon a short recess was taken.)

Presiding Inspector: Now, Mr. Grossman.

By Mr. Grossman:

Q. Mr. Bridges, would the 1934 strike have been lost if there had been no Marine Workers Industrial Union? A. Yes.

Mr. Del Guercio: Well, if your Honor please,—

Presiding Inspector: (Interposing) I think that is too speculative.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Mr. Grossman: Your Honor, I would say that for some people that would be speculative, but for one who not only has the trade union experience that Mr. Bridges had at that time but has obtained since, and with his close connection with [5421] the strike, you might not agree with his conclusions, but I am sure it is not his conclusions because he is dealing with a field which he knows as well as the handwriting expert knows his field. And I don't think it is at all speculative to remove one element. I think any expert can remove one element, and I think he is capable of doing it. Now, I am perfectly willing to get detail or proof in explanation of his answer, but I am sure that that is not speculative.

Presiding Inspector: Strike it out for the time being and put in the details.

Mr. Grossman: I will ask him the question.

Presiding Inspector: Very well.

By Mr. Grossman:

Q. What difference would it have made in the strength of the unions involved in the strike, Mr. Bridges, if there had been no Marine Workers Industrial Union?

Mr. Del Guercio: I will object to that.

Presiding Inspector: That calls for statistics. I will take it in that sense.

A. The longshore strike would have been lost like all similar strikes were lost in the entire history—

Presiding Inspector: (Interposing) The first

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

question is, How much would that have weakened your strength on the waterfront?

The Witness: I doubt if I know how you could compute [5422] that. You couldn't put it in terms of members, your Honor.

By Mr. Grossman:

Q. Let me ask you specific questions. Would there have been in the early part of the strike a smaller number of seamen on strike if there had been no M.W.I.U.?

Mr. Del Guercio: If your Honor please, I will object to that as being purely speculative.

Presiding Inspector: I think that calls for an estimate really of the number of these M.W.I.U. men who were striking.

Mr. Grossman: The members and the supporters. In other words, those that would respond to a call of their strike.

Presiding Inspector: Yes. I think I will take that, as statistical.

Mr. Del Guercio: Without detracting, of course, from Mr. Bridges' experience as a trade union man, from his own testimony here so far he was just a working man during the 1934 strike and he hadn't achieved that prominence at that time yet. Counsel is asking questions regarding that 1934 strike, which his position was just as Chairman of the Strike Committee.

Presiding Inspector: That is the top of the heap, I suppose.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Mr. Del Guercio: There were Union officials at that time that were much greater in importance and prominence than Mr. [5423] Bridges.

Presiding Inspector: I think I will take this. I am not recognizing the soundness of the theory. I have told Mr. Grossman that I am taking this without recognizing or denying the soundness of his theory. That is to be considered subsequently. I am taking this proof, though, along the lines of Mr. Grossman's theory, as he suggested it, without passing upon the soundness of his argument.

Mr. Grossman: All right.

Presiding Inspector: You understand that?

Mr. Grossman: Yes, I understand that.

By Mr. Grossman:

Q. In the early part of the strike—that will mean, let us say, the month of May—what difference would there have been in the number of seamen out on strike if there had been no M.W.I.U.?

A. They would have been very few seamen on strike. The seamen did not trust the Seamen's Union at that time for very good and substantial reasons. And, in addition, when we struck the Seamen's Union—

Mr. Myron: (Interposing: I think he answered the question, your Honor.

Mr. Grossman: Well, we'll see.

Mr. Myron: I think any further answer would not be responsive.

Presiding Inspector: I think I will take his explanation. [5424] This is corollary.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

A. (Continuing): The Seamen's Union officially and publicly had received quite an amount of publicity on the matter, ordered and instructed the seamen to stay aboard the ships. Therefore, we were in the position where the longshoremen were striking and the seamen were ordered to stay at work and if there had not been another union in the field to start the move to get the seamen off the ships eventually we would have got a certain number, but not for quite a while, and the number of seamen that would come off the ships under those conditions would have been very few.

By Mr. Grossman:

Q. Was there any relationship between the existence of the M.W.I.U. and its being on strike and the fact that the ISU ultimately declared a strike?

Mr. Del Guercio: Just a moment, please! I didn't get the question.

Mr. Grossman: Will you read it back, please, Mr. Reporter.

(The question referred to was read by the reporter as above recorded.)

Mr. Del Guercio: I don't understand the question. Maybe the witness does.

Mr. Grossman: I will ask it again. I think the witness does, but I think Mr. Del Guercio is entitled to understand it.

Mr. Del Guercio: Yes. [5425]

Mr. Gladstein: Make it more simple.

Mr. Del Guercio: If you can.



(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Counsel was addressing his remarks to me, if your Honor please.

Mr. Grossman: I am perfectly willing to make it more simple, Mr. Del Guercio.

Mr. Gladstein: I was making that suggestion to my co-counsel.

By Mr. Grossman:

Q. The thing I am concerned with, Mr. Bridges, is whether the result of the vote of the ISU to go on strike in approximately ten days after the strike began would have been the same had there been no M.W.I.U on strike at that time.

A. Absolutely not.

Q. Can you state whether the ISU would have continued during the month of May not to strike had there been no M.W.I.U.?

Mr. Del Guercio: I will object to that, if your Honor please, as calling for purely speculation.

Presiding Inspector: I don't think you can go that far.

Mr. Grossman: I don't think that is more speculative than the other.

By Mr. Grossman:

Q. Mr. Bridges, I would like to have you state from your experience what is the importance in a strike of having [5426] a union giving leadership to the men who come out on strike or it is desired should come out on strike.

Mr. Del Guercio: I will object to that as being compound.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Presiding Inspector: Don't you think that is pretty self-evident?

Mr. Grossman: It may be to some people and its true significance may not appear to those people, your Honor. I think we are entitled to have an expert explain how much difference it would make.

Mr. Del Guercio: We are not trying an expert.

Mr. Grossman: I would say this, Your Honor: "To me it seems elementary, except the fact that by reason of Mr. Bridges being unwilling to accept the spontaneous striking of these men and preferring rather that they should be led rather than the M.W.I.U., the Government would wish to deport him for that alone, among other things, but they are willing to deport him for that alone.

Presiding Inspector: Not quite that.

Mr. Grossman: Well, the way they define "affiliation" your Honor; the mere fact of helping the M.W.I.U. get members of and support from the seamen constitutes "affiliation" with the M.W.I.U. and a ground for deportation under the theory of the Government. Now, since— [5427]

Presiding Inspector: (Interposing) There is a little more added to that.

Mr. Grossman: I beg your pardon?

Presiding Inspector: There is a little more added to that: That they were mutually assisting each other.

Mr. Grossman: Not according to what they suggest. They talk about "support" as being synonymous with "affiliation".

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Presiding Inspector: The receiving of support and the mutual obligations and duties implied in that, I suppose.

Mr. Grossman: That is not in their definition, your Honor.

Presiding Inspector: Only implicit in the word "support."

Mr. Grossman: Well, I think so. I think "support"——

Presiding Inspector: (Interposing) I disagree with you. I think that is implicit, but you may be right about it.

Mr. Del Guercio: We don't adopt counsel's definition. We will advance our own theory.

Mr. Grossman: Let us assume even that the Government would be accepting the definition of "affiliation" that was accepted in the last hearing. Nevertheless, apparently, their theory is that this cooperation, such as it is of Mr. Bridges, that is, helping the M.W.I.U bring the seamen out on strike, is sufficient to justify his deportation. Now, either the Government thinks that one should be deported for trade union activity simply; I mean, the theory at least of the Prosecution here; or else they assume that Mr. Bridges had a responsibility [5428] to stand idly by and let the men come out spontaneously on strike without having the M.W.I.U, because they had no other union, bring them out on strike. That changes the picture slightly and I think justifies having Mr. Bridges explain how much help there was in the strike so far as the seamen are concerned

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

in having a union there to take them in as members and to give them leadership.

That's why I think we are entitled to go into it.

Mr. Del Guercio: If your Honor please, as I——

Presiding Inspector: (Interposing) Just a moment!

Of course, Mr. Grossman, I don't want to suggest this but I suppose the Government would claim that that was justifying association, affiliation, membership even with a subversive body if it had a good purpose, that argument.

Mr. Grossman: What do you mean by "justify"? Do you mean making it non-deportable?

Presiding Inspector: I mean it wouldn't be a violation of the statute if, for a good purpose, to win the strike for a proper organization of loyal Americans a step was taken to accept membership in a subversive organization. You see, it leads to wide fields for consideration. But I am going to take your view so far as the reception of evidence is concerned. You may go on.

By Mr. Grossman:

Q. What difference does it make from a trade union standpoint that there is a union in existence to give leader- [5429] ship to and to be a place for membership in for strikers and potential strikers?

A. A difference in winning or losing the strike.

Mr. Myron: I didn't hear that answer.

By Mr. Grossman:

Q. Could you receive——

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Presiding Inspector: (Interposing) "The difference between winning and losing a strike."

By Mr. Grossman:

Q. Could you explain what difference it makes? Why can't workers who go out on strike spontaneously without a union could be just as effective and strong in a strike?

Presiding Inspector: Don't you think it is perfectly apparent? It is like a class of boys without a teacher.

Mr. Grossman: Then I can't understand one of the elements of the Government's case. As I say, I thought that was self-evident, but apparently not.

Presiding Inspector: I think it is self-evident that leadership is necessary to a joint enterprise. Do you think there is any doubt about it?

Mr. Grossman: The Government went so far as to cite as so-called admissions from the last hearing Mr. Bridges' statements along this line: That he cooperated with the M.W.I.U for trade union purposes in order to have greater strength, in order to win the strike. And they take our time to read those things as what they called "admissions" on the theory [5430] apparently that these are sufficient to tend to establish at least the deportability of Harry Bridges. Now, you remember that.

Presiding Inspector: Oh, yes. I remember it very well.

Mr. Grossman: And those admissions, so-called, all dealt with cooperating for legitimate trade union purposes with the M.W.I.U.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Presiding Inspector: I know. But there are certain things that you can cooperate in and there are certain things that you can't cooperate with.

Mr. Grossman: Yes.

Presiding Inspector: And if you do cooperate in these improper things it doesn't make any difference what your purpose is.

Mr. Grossman: What's proper, your Honor?

Presiding Inspector: What is that?

Mr. Grossman: What's proper?

Presiding Inspector: I mean to say, if you called in to assist you—I am taking it from the general type of evidence we have had here—to win the strike, the whole force of a subversive organization, you are cooperating with them no matter what your purpose may be.

Mr. Grossman: Well, is that a deportable purpose?

Presiding Inspector: I should think so.

Mr. Grossman: To win a strike? You mean, asking for aid of the Communist Party is sufficient?

[5431]

Presiding Inspector: Yes, I should think so.

Mr. Grossman: To constitute deportability?

Presiding Inspector: I should think so. Supposing they contributed to the persons who win the strike?

Mr. Grossman: I would say this, your Honor—

Presiding Inspector: (Interposing) The definition is right in the statute on that.

Mr. Myron: May I say this, if your Honor please?



(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

That there is no question pending and apparently the last question—

Presiding Inspector: (Interposing) I know, but we are discussing the general admissibility of all this evidence. I am going to take it, but I don't think it is conclusive by any means.

Mr. Del Guercio: The Court has expressed our theory correctly, if your Honor please.

Presiding Inspector: I was trying to express the Government's view, not my own.

Mr. Del Guercio: No, the Government's view.

Mr. Gladstein: May I ask a question simply for clarity?

Presiding Inspector: Certainly, Mr. Gladstein.

Mr. Gladstein: Your last remarks give me this impression: That is, your interpretation of the Government's theory, as I understand it, would be, to put it in my own word so I can understand it, along this line: That if Harry Bridges accepted [5432] the assistance as a Union leader engaged in a strike, accepted the assistance of another organization or found it necessary to work with that organization in the conduct of the strike in order to win that strike, and that strike was a legal strike in the sense that it was a strike for those purposes which are recognized by American jurisprudence as perfectly legitimate; that that organization, not necessarily the members of the organization with whom Harry Bridges came into contact, but if that organization is shown to have had an affiliation with another organization known as the Trade Union

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Unity League, and if the Trade Union Unity League is shown to have had another affiliation with some other organization, and in the face of a ruling which theretofore, as I understand it, had been made by the Department of Labor; in the face of all that, is it the Government's contention that Mr. Bridges would be deportable on that ground?

Presiding Inspector: I think it. That is my understanding of the Government's theory.

Mr. Gladstein: Then essentially it boils down to this: That the difference between being deportable or not deportable, as far as an alien is concerned, on this question of M.W.I.U. affiliation; the difference is whether or not a man does those things which he considers necessary and which probably most people would consider perfectly appropriate in order to win the strike, on the one hand, in contrast with sitting idly by [5433] and allowing the strike to be lost.

In other words, if the strike was lost and unsuccessful because you didn't accept the aid of those seamen who were willing to give it, why then, you are a fine loyal American. But if you do something as a Union leader to accept the support of those seamen who are willing to assist the longshoremen in winning that strike and you actually do win your strike, then according to the Government's theory you are deportable.

Presiding Inspector: I think that is part of the Government's contention.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Mr. Gladstein: I just wanted the Government's understanding.

Mr. Myron: The statute is plain.

Presiding Inspector: I understand that is part of the Government's contention. I am not passing on the soundness of it or on the soundness of the other side.

Mr. Grossman: All right.

Presiding Inspector: Now, we have had a long discussion. I hope it is elucidating.

Mr. Grossman: I believe the last question, your Honor, was a request from Mr. Bridges to explain further his statement that unions make a difference.

Presiding Inspector: Yes, I think it is self-evident. But if you think you should have it in the record——

Mr. Grossman: (Interposing) In the light of what we have been discussing, I think it is necessary.

[5434]

Presiding Inspector: Go ahead, Mr. Bridges. Tell them what you think about it.

The Witness: They have got to be organized for purposes of unity, solidarity, purposes of morale, purposes of getting things down or feeding them, of having activity toward winning the strike. Otherwise you have just got a mob. You have got a mob that is liable to do anything. They are liable to wreck your whole strike by individual terroristic action. They are liable to confuse the entire situation, and the difference between having workers organized in some sort of an organization, irregard-

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

less of name—name doesn't matter, or at the particular time even affiliation doesn't matter. It is purpose and organization that matters; and the difference between having the workers in such an organization which gives them the right to move in an organized manner, gives them organized leadership, gives them an organized program, and not having them in such an organization. On the one hand, you have got a mob that can be many, many hundreds or thousands of times larger and be ineffective, and on the other hand you have got an organized group that can be much smaller and much more effective because they are organized they have a program, they know where they are going, they know how to express themselves and they know how to win.

By Mr. Grossman:

Q. What is the—

Presiding Inspector: (Interposing) I don't think there would be any difference of opinion on that. I think it is self- [5435] evident.

Mr. Del Guercio: Well, I was reminded, if the Court please, of the Communist Manifesto.

Mr. Grossman: Well, all right. If you want to be reminded by that—

Presiding Inspector: Yes. We all remember the Marx-Engels Manifesto.

By Mr. Grossman:

Q. You were making a statement previously, Mr. Bridges, about the fact that this strike had succeeded where other strikes had failed by reason of the sea-

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

men participating. I wonder if you would explain exactly what you meant by that.

Mr. Del Guercio: If your Honor please, I object to that line. That is purely speculation as to what might have happened under other circumstances. We don't know. This witness don't know.

Mr. Grossman: I have laid a basis. I am coming back to it. This calls for what has happened in other strikes.

Presiding Inspector: Do you think we need to go into that?

Mr. Grossman: I want to lay the basis for the question that I started, and I don't know whether I have laid it fully or not.

Presiding Inspector: Why don't you ask that question?

Mr. Grossman: All right. [5436]

By Mr. Grossman:

Q. If there had been no M.W.I.U would the 1934 strike have been won or lost?

Mr. Del Guercio: If your Honor please, I object to that. The facts are that there was a Marine Workers Industrial Union.

Presiding Inspector: I will take his opinion for what it is worth.

A. I'm not sure and I wouldn't say that that single factor alone would result in losing the strike. I could be positive that the fact that they did exist resulted in us winning the strike and getting better conditions or a better settlement. But to say that the Marine Workers Industrial Union alone with the



(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

longshoremen as a single factor would have lost the strike, I think would be incorrect. There were other factors. A very important factor, even more important than the Marine Workers Industrial Union, was the Teamsters organization. But there is no question that what helped us organize the strike and make it tight and what, therefore, led to the Teamsters' strike and in concert with us and other groups striking in concert with us were the initial moves that began first with the longshoremen and second with the seamen, and enabled us to finally wind up the strike with definite gains and benefits and organization to the men involved.

Mr. Del Guercio: If your Honor please, in view of this witness' statement, I think it will answer counsel's question [5437] and will stop all further inquiry along that point. I think the witness has indicated that there were other people on strike and other leaders than himself in that 1934 strike. Apparently he wasn't the only one. I understand that there were some five or six thousand longshoremen on strike at the same time and all had their little part in it, too.

Mr. Gladstein: Then perhaps we had better suggest to Mr. Bridges that he testify so clearly that Mr. Del Guercio should not get the impression that Mr. Bridges claims to have been the only longshoreman on strike.

Presiding Inspector: There is no doubt about it. Go ahead.

You didn't make any motion, did you?



(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Mr. Del Guercio: No.

Presiding Inspector: It was an explanation of your attitude; I mean, of your position, the Government's position. Go ahead, Mr. Grossman.

By Mr. Grossman:

Q. How many hours a day did the picketing go on during the strike? A. Twenty-four.

Q. Were there several shifts of pickets?

A. Four, six hours a shift.

Q. And were the shifts equal in size? [5438]

A. Generally speaking yes, except on occasions when they would be strengthened.

Q. Did you say, Mr. Bridges, that there were one or two Governmental Commissions during this strike, Commissions or Committees?

A. There were two, really. We had the first Mediation Board, Mediation Commission that arrived at a compromise settlement that was rejected. That was prior to the strike. That was arrived at in the process of mediation in an attempt to stop the strike. That was practically unanimously rejected.

Q. By whom?

A. I wasn't any coast official at that time. I wasn't even an official of the Local. It was rejected by the—it was rejected by the coast officials in the main and practically the entire coast membership.

[5439]

Q. Who was on that Commission?

A. Judge Reynolds of Seattle; Dean Grady, at that time Dean of the University of California; and a Doctor of Economics from U.C.L.A. I forget his

(Testimony of Harry Renton/Bridges.)

name. I forget his name. And that Commission functioned up until May 28, 1934 where they came,— brought forth another compromise proposal that was also rejected by the coast membership.

Q. Do you recall what that proposal was that they made during the strike?

A. Yes. It was what we call the May 28th proposal and it provided for a system of hiring through a hiring hall that still left the possibilities, the actual possibilities of discrimination wide open and still left the possibilities of the destruction of the union wide open. And it was rejected. It was rejected by every coast local. Our local was the only one that took a referendum on it. I recall that. The San Francisco Longshore Local, we insisted on a secret ballot for to reject it and to get some idea of the strength of the rank and file. It was rejected by 2400 to 80. All other locals voted it down in a voice vote.

Q. Now, was there another committee, Government committee or commission functioning during the strike?

A. That just about disbanded that commission, and then the other commission, which was the second commission, of Mr. McGrady, Archbishop Hanna and Mr. Cushing was created. [5440]

Q. Did that commission make any proposal to settle the strike?

A. It made a certain proposal from time to time, and they were generally rejected; rejected for two or three basic reasons, as I recall it.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Q. How was the strike finally settled?

A. By an agreement that the longshoremen return to work without discrimination because of strike activities; that all strike breakers at that time working on the waterfront or on the docks would be discharged; and that all issues in dispute would be submitted to arbitration between the representatives of the employers on a coastwise basis and the representatives of the union on a coastwise basis. In other words, recognition was completely granted to that extent, and another of our demands was no separate port agreements but one coastwise agreement. And, in addition to that, recognition was granted the seamen, and it was agreed that they would also return to work and all their demands be submitted to arbitration. And we all returned to work together on July 31st under those conditions. The only difference between the settlement for the seamen and the longshoremen was that certain groups of the seamen, the deep-water groups, had to take a vote for purposes of representation as against the Marine Workers Industrial Union or no union. In other words, it was a plebescite at that time. [5441]

Q. How long after the end of the general strike was this strike ended?

A. The general strike ended July 20th. The marine strike ended July 31st.

Q. Were negotiations being carried on with the employers for the settling of the strike and, if so, during what period?

(Testimony of Harry Renton, Bridges.)

A. All during the strike period, from prior to May 9th and from May 9th on. [5442]

Q. Did you participate in those negotiations?

A. Not until after this May 28th proposal. I was about to explain it.

The negotiations were being carried on by a committee of the coast, a coast committee. I was not a member of that committee. I had no official position in the local except as a member of the Executive Board and Chairman of the Strike Committee.

When this May 28th proposal, as we called it, was brought back the men were somewhat incensed at what the proposal contained, and insisted that I be elected to sit on the Committee.

From that time on until June 16th I sat in the negotiations.

On June 16th another agreement was executed and signed without our knowledge.

Q. Without whose knowledge?

A. Without the knowledge of the men on strike, in an attempt to break the strike. That was repudiated, and that was the time that the Joint Marine Strike Committee was formed. From then on they negotiated the strike to a settlement.

Q. After the general strike ended were there daily negotiations with the shipowners for the settlement of the strike?

A. Yes.

Q. Would there be every day?

A. Yes. [5443]

Q. Were you in on those negotiations?

A. Yes.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Q. During the general strike, were there any negotiations with the employers? A. Yes.

Q. Daily?

A. Yes. There were negotiations held with the employers, with the Mediation Board at that time sitting in with the parties.

Q. From June 16th on, did you participate in every negotiation involving the longshoremen with the employers? A. Yes.

Q. Were you out of San Francisco—put it this way: Were you more than 50 miles out of San Francisco during the 1934 strike? A. No.

Q. Are you positive about that?

A. Absolutely positive about it.

Q. What is the basis of your being positive on this matter?

A. I have a very good recollection of every day of that strike. After all, the strike was brought about—there is no question but what the whole thing was somewhat of a wild affair in many respects. The men were pretty desperate. The majority of them, it is safe to say, did not realize the seriousness of that strike, although they worked very effectively [5444] in fighting, prosecuting the strike.

Mr. Myron: Is this responsive to the question?

Mr. Grossman: I think it is.

Presiding Inspector: He is giving the reason why he is so certain.

Mr. Myron: As a basis of his recollection?

Presiding Inspector: I will allow it.



(Testimony of Harry Reinton Bridges.)

A. (Continuing): I distinctly recall that we met every day, practically, including every Sunday. I recall the days we had off. There was so much activity, and so many meetings, and so much to do, and so many events to fix it in my mind, that I couldn't possibly be mistaken.

By Mr. Grossman:

Q. Did you leave San Francisco at all during that strike?

A. I went to Oakland, I went to Crockett, I made one trip to San Jose, and I went as far as Stockton. They were the only trips I made.

Q. Did you ever go farther from San Francisco than Stockton during the 1934 strike?

A. If Stockton is farther than San Jose, which it is—

Q. (Interposing) It is.

A. No. That was the farthest point that I went to.

Q. Were you in Los Angeles at any time during the 1934 strike? [5445]

A. No. I was in Los Angeles in January 1934; and I wasn't down in Los Angeles again until September, 1934.

Q. What is the best date you can give as to the time when you first joined, rather, when you joined the IWW?

Mr. Myron: The best date?

Mr. Grossman: Yes.

A. July 21, 1921.



(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

By Mr. Grossman:

Q. How did you happen to join with reference to whether someone asked you to join?

A. The main reason was on account of the attitude of the leaders of the Sailors' Strike at that time. The strike was eventually smashed. The Seamen were on strike by themselves. The attitude of the leaders was to seek no help from the longshoremen, or anybody else. The strike could only end one way, and it did, and we were smashed.

Q. What part did the IWW play in that strike?

A. At that time they had a program of greater solidarity, cooperation between the longshoremen and the seamen, support of the seamen by the longshoremen, more democratic unionism, and a more definite prosecution of the strike toward a settlement.

Q. Did the IWW at that time and place play any part in leading the strike, or attempt to lead the strike, or any part of it? [5446]

A. In attempting to lead it; yes.

Q. How large was the membership of the IWW union to which you belonged at that time?

A. I can't recall that; I don't really know. They had quite a strong movement in the south at that time.

Q. How long did you remain a member of the IWW?

A. I think until the end of '21 or the early part of 1922.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Q. Why did you drop out, if you did drop out, of the IWW?

Presiding Inspector: Hasn't he told that earlier to you?

Mr. Grossman: Only partially.

Presiding Inspector: I think he told that this morning.

Mr. Grossman: I am not sure that it is as clear as it might be.

Presiding Inspector: I thought it was very clear. You may ask, if you wish to, if you think this is something helpful.

A. The organization was syndicalistic and anarchistic. Its method of operation allowed too much for provocative action. Its aims were pretty general, except in a specific situation when there were a certain set of facts at hand, and its aims were pretty general. Although they were the organization at that time that had a wonderful record that impressed me, and they did a tremendous amount of work, as a [5447] staid, permanent organization—at least I thought I knew enough about trade unionism to know it wasn't going to last very long. And I disagreed entirely with the attitude regarding no political action, because I had enough knowledge of trade unionism, even in Australia, to know that no union could keep any gains it made by economic action without some form of political action.

Of course, the IWW was always strongly against any form of political action. They finally got so syndicalistic and anarchistic, as I said, that nobody

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

knew what was heads or tails of the outfit—everybody was a General.

Q. Mr. Bridges, I am going to hand you a book which, for the record, is a "History of Criminal Syndicalism Legislation in the United States," which appears to be a thesis of some kind, perhaps a doctrinal thesis, by Eldridge Foster Dowell, printed in 1939 by the Johns Hopkins Press, and call your specific attention to Chapter 1.

I will ask the question after I have shown it to counsel.

(The book referred to was passed to Mr. Del Guercio.)

Mr. Del Guercio: Are you referring to just the first paragraph?

Mr. Grossman: The entire Chapter.

Mr. Del Guercio: The entire Chapter?

Mr. Grossman: I think, when you hear the reference, you will see there is no need for you to read it all now, but you [5448] have a right to do that, of course.

Mr. Del Guercio: I don't want to read the whole thing unless—

Presiding Inspector: This book is a history of criminal syndicalism—

Mr. Grossman: (Interposing) It is a history of criminal syndicalism legislation, but Chapter 1 deals with the theories, practices and doctrines of the—

Presiding Inspector: Of the IWW.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

You don't need any more than Mr. Bridges himself has given on that, do you?

Mr. Grossman: There is more I want.

By Mr. Grossman:

Q. I want to show you this, Mr. Bridges, and ask you whether you have read Chapter 1 of this book?

A. (Examining book): Yes, I have read this.

Q. Will you state whether Chapter 1 of that book correctly states the theories and doctrines, official theories and doctrines, of the IWW as you understood them at the time you joined the organization?

Mr. Del Guercio: If your Honor please, I object to the question on a number of grounds: First, the book that he has shown the witness—if I may have it for just a moment, Mr. Bridges—is a book entitled "A History of Criminal Syndicalism Legislation in the United States," by Eldridge Foster Dowell, [5449] Ph. D., Instructor in History and Political Science, Hollins College, printed in Baltimore by the Johns Hopkins Press in 1939. It purports to state the theories, practices and doctrines of the IWW. It purports to be what the author of the book thought the doctrines, practices and theories of the IWW were at that time, as he saw them, in 1939.

I haven't read the book. This is the first time I have seen it.

For those reasons, I can't understand how this witness could possibly have any—

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Mr. Grossman: (Interposing) We don't want to rush this.

Mr. Del Guercio: Let me finish—I can't see what possible bearing even an affirmative answer of this witness would have on the doctrines, practices and theories of the IWW as shown by the literature, by their own literature, that is, the literature of the IWW.

Presiding Inspector: I don't see how we can receive that any more than any other history.

Mr. Grossman: May I say this: As I understand the law of evidence generally, a man may take what he believes to be facts at a certain time, or it is possible also to show him a book, or a document, which purports to state those things, and ask him whether it correctly states, or agrees with his state of mind. [5450]

Presiding Inspector: I never heard of such a rule.

Mr. Grossman: I understand that I can, and it will certainly save time for this reason, your Honor.

I don't want this rushed, and I certainly want your Honor, before this is permitted, if there is any question about it, to read it over and see,—

Presiding Inspector: Even in a court in a medical case you can only confront a witness on cross examination by recognized authorities.

Mr. Grossman: Let me finish my statement.

This book purports to be an academic and scientific statement, this Chapter, at least, as to the IWW. It purports to be that. I am not vouching

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

for the academic standing of the author. It is one of the few books we have been able to find that purports to do that sort of thing. It purports to state what were the official doctrines and theories of the IWW at certain times. It purports to quote from their official resolutions and the convention decisions, and other things that would be correctly stated.

We are introducing it, not as the author's views, but as the doctrines of that organization. If Mr. Bridges agrees with the author, and to the extent that he does, that those were the doctrines as he understood them, quite obviously what Mr. Bridges thought the IWW believed in—whether it did or not doesn't matter—but what he thought it believed in at the [5451] time he joined it is material to his state of mind, quite obviously.

Mr. Del Guercio: On that statement alone it isn't material.

Mr. Grossman: You can answer my statement when I finish.

I say, what Mr. Bridges believes of the doctrines of the organization is material and what weight you give the evidence is another matter.

I can go through that point by point, and footnote by footnote, and ask Mr. Bridges, "Did you understand this legislation had been passed at this convention?" or "What is its position on sabotage?" which I think is an undue waste of time because I think if he has read it—if counsel has a chance to read it—and he states that the description



(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

which it purports to give of the doctrines of the organization in 1920 and 1921, when he joined, correctly represents what he thought it was, I think it is relevant for that purpose.

Presiding Inspector: I don't suppose his belief as to what they represented is material.

Mr. Grossman: Let me give you an example. Let us suppose—

Presiding Inspector: It may be the statute is perfectly clear on that.

Mr. Grossman: Let me state this: Let us suppose, now, that the Government should be able to establish—I don't [5452] agree that they can, and I am not making any statement on that at this time—but let's suppose they should be able to establish that the doctrines of the IWW were such as to make—well put it this way—such as to constitute that phrase which is descriptive in the statute. Let us suppose they should find they believed in sabotage. Let us suppose we could establish that if the IWW held those doctrines, believed in sabotage, it was not known by 98 per cent of their membership, and not known by Mr. Bridges. Are you stating the statute should be interpreted in such a way to deport a man for belonging to an organization which has a theory which he didn't recognize to be true, but, in fact, he recognized the contrary, and which wasn't recognized to be true by 99 per cent of the membership? I would say Congress certainly never intended the statute to be so interpreted.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Now, quite obviously, as will appear from the testimony, Mr. Bridges believed that the IWW, when he belonged to it, had certain views. He didn't believe that the organization believed in sabotage; he didn't believe that it held certain other views that might be considered in violation of this statute. If he held those beliefs, that is, if he felt the organization didn't believe in sabotage, and if he thought the organization didn't believe in these other things, it is certainly relevant and within a reasonable interpretation of the statute.

If it is relevant I think this is the shortest way to prove [5453] it. I much prefer that, and I think your Honor should proceed in taking what purports to be an academic statement of it, and asking Mr. Bridges as to the whole statement, instead of footnote by footnote, and resolution by resolution, whether it agrees with what he understood at the time.

Mr. Del Guercio: If the Court please, in the first place, of course the authenticity of this book hasn't been established. You will recall the difficulties the Government had in getting these documents in, of the IWW, in evidence.

Now, here he is handing the Alien here a book and would want us to believe that it was written by so and so, and that it contains such and such a thing, without offering any proof of its authenticity.

Regardless of all that counsel forgets what the Alien is charged with in regard to the IWW.

The Alien is not charged with belonging to an

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

organization that believes in, advises, advocates and teaches sabotage, or that the ~~Alien~~ belonged to an organization that advised, believed in, and advocated the unlawful destruction of property.

He is charged with—I can't repeat the exact language without consulting the charge lodged—with belonging to an organization that distributed literature advocating and advising the unlawful destruction of property and sabotage.

Now, regardless of what this witness here may have believed the doctrines of the IWW have been at that time, that is immaterial in view of those charges. [5454]

The best answer to counsel is the case of Tisi vs. Tod, the decision having been handed down by the Supreme Court not so long ago.

Mrs. King: Tisi v. Tod?

Mr. Del Guercio: Yes. I don't know what the citation is off-hand.

If I recollect the facts correctly in this case the alien was arrested, having been found distributing Communistic literature. The evidence at the hearing showed that he was unable to read English and, therefore, could not understand the contents of the literature, and did not know the contents of the literature that he was distributing. He was charged, among other charges, if I recall correctly, with distributing Communistic literature and belonging to an organization—

Presiding Inspector: Was this a court case or a deportation case?

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Mr. Del Guercio: A deportation case.

The Supreme Court held that it did not make any difference whether or not he knew the contents of the literature he was distributing.

I think that case is very apropos here.

Presiding Inspector: I would like to read that case.

Mrs. King: If your Honor please——

Mr. Del Guercio: (Interposing) I don't purport to state all of the facts in the case accurately.

[5455]

Presiding Inspector: No.

Mrs. King: In that case I understand the holding of Mr. Justice Brandeis—I believe the case is 263 U. S., but I am not quite sure of the citation—the question was, rather, whether the Immigration Service, then the Secretary of Labor, was correct in its conclusion that the Alien really did know what he was distributing. I mean it wasn't only a question of knowledge, but this Alien testified that he could not read it. It was a question of fact as to whether the Secretary of Labor could hold that he did understand it.

I do not think that the case is at all clear for the proposition that regardless of whether he understood it the statute made his deportation mandatory.

It is interesting, although perhaps not entirely relevant (that after the decision of the United States Supreme Court the Warrant of Arrest against Catona Tisi was cancelled and he, Tisi, is still in the United States. In view of the decision of Mr. Jus-

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

tice Brandeis the Labor Department changed its view and it shows that this is an Administrative proposition and not a Judicial one. We are now in the Administrative phase of the case, such a deportation case. [5456]

Presiding Inspector: That is something that you can argue to the Attorney General, if I should advise the Attorney General that Mr. Bridges was a member of this organization these many years ago and that his idea of the organization is just as he stated it. But that wouldn't be for this tribunal here, this advisory tribunal.

Mrs. King: We are trying to get into this record for your determination—

Presiding Inspector: (Interposing) You are quite right, Mrs. King.

Mrs. King: (Continuing) —and for the determination of the Attorney General the character of the IWW, and we believe that this is a fair representation. But we also feel that the Alien's own views, Mr. Bridges' own views of the theories of the IWW are relevant. I believe it was in the Thomas Trust case that Secretary Post determined—and I think that case is footnoted to Skeffington v. Katzeff, or perhaps Judge Anderson's opinion in the lower court in the Collyer v. Skeffington case—that automatic membership in an organization did not constitute membership within the meaning of the statute, and it seems to me that what Mr. Bridges thinks of the organization has a bearing.



(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

There has never been, as far as I know, a decided ruling to the effect that where an alien has no knowledge of the character of the organization that he is nevertheless under the statute [5457] subject to deportation.

Now, we may be wrong on that theory; but we are at least entitled to make a record as to Mr. Bridges' views on the Industrial Workers of the World.

Presiding Inspector: But he has already given them, hasn't he?

Mrs. King: I don't believe so. He has given his views as to why he got out of it, but not of its philosophy while he was in it.

Presiding Inspector: He told why he got in and why he got out.

Mrs. King: Yes. Both of those things he has told, but still hasn't told what the organization in its general principles and theories stood for. And also with reference to Mr. Del Guercio's position, that it may have distributed literature, it is not my understanding of the meaning of the statute that, if an organization has one piece of literature which it distributed at one time, which an alien has knowledge of, that every alien who is ever connected with that organization, past or present, is for that reason deportable.

It seems to me that under our constitutional form of government and our right of free speech and free assembly that that is an incorrect interpretation of the statute. Now, I may be wrong as to that, but



(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

I still maintain the right to make a record on this. And I don't feel that the general prin- [5458] ciples of the IWW have been gone into, and I should like to suggest to your Honor that before tomorrow it may be possible for you to look at this and see the difference in the character of the material contained in this chapter with reference to the general principles of organization rather than the material which Mr. Bridges has suggested about the organization, which is purely of a trade union character and which had nothing to do with its general underlying principles, and particularly with its views on the subject of sabotage and the unlawful destruction of property which is involved in the statute that we now have under consideration.

Mr. Gladstein: Could I suggest, your Honor, it is ten minutes—

Mr. Del Guercio: (Interposing) May I say that this book here was written in 1939. Bridges was a member of this IWW in 1921. It would be a strange coincidence, strange indeed, if this man here, Mr. Hopkins, or whoever wrote this book, would in 1939 expound the same theories about the IWW that Mr. Bridges had when he first landed in this country.

Presiding Inspector: Well, let me see this book.

Mr. Gladstein: May I suggest, since it is ten after four, that your Honor take this book overnight and look at the first chapter, with the understanding that we are not offering this book as proof of what the IWW actually stood for, because we don't know whether this man who wrote it claims

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

to be an authority [5459] on the IWW as a member of it or anything of that sort. But at least for the purpose of framing this question which was asked, whether that discussion reflects in any way—now, it may not or it may only in part—reflects in any way the opinions and beliefs of the organization at the time. It is simply a suggestion that you examine it before you rule on it.

Since it is past the adjournment hour anyway and no harm could result from your taking under consideration until tomorrow morning the passing on this question—

Presiding Inspector: (Interposing) Oh, I will read the first chapter.

Mr. Goodwin: Your Honor—

Presiding Inspector: Just a minute.

Mr. Goodwin: I was going to suggest this, your Honor, if I may. If they want to ask him what his beliefs were or what his ideas were at that time, that's one thing. We think that is entirely immaterial. But to have him look at the book and say, Did that represent—a book, of course, which he had never seen—Does that represent what your ideas were at that time? I think that that is too far-fetched.

If they want to examine him in regard to what his ideas of what the IWW actually were, I think that those questions should be subject to the objection that that is entirely immaterial. But, in any event, this sort of a question, whether that particular book represented what he thought, is en-

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

tirely, [5460] it seems to me, illogical and improper and inadmissible.

Presiding Inspector: You don't want me to read these footnotes? Only the text?

Mr. Grossman: I think you will find in some of the footnotes, which you will easily see, more specific references to the resolutions and decisions of the IWW than the text. But I am sure, running through the text, you will find which of the footnotes are relevant.

Presiding Inspector: There are a great many factual matters. They certainly wouldn't be competent.

Mr. Grossman: That is right. You won't find much relevant in this book.

Mr. Del Guercio: While you are reading, you might also read the pamphlets that the Government has offered.

Mr. Grossman: We have no objection to that.

Presiding Inspector: I know something about them.

All right. We will take a recess until tomorrow morning at ten o'clock.

(Whereupon, at 4:10 o'clock p.m. an adjournment was taken until Wednesday, May 28, 1941, at 10:00 o'clock a.m.) [5461]

Court Room 276,  
Federal Building,  
San Francisco, California  
May 28, 1941

Met, pursuant to adjournment, at 10:00 A. M.,

[5462]

### PROCEEDINGS

Presiding Inspector: This is off the record.

(Remarks outside the record.)

Presiding Inspector: Now, you may proceed,  
Mr. Grossman.

### HARRY RENTON BRIDGES

called as a witness in his own behalf, having been previously duly sworn, testified further as follows:

Mr. Grossman: Your Honor, I would like to offer in evidence the letter of Mr. Meyer, giving certain information on the statutes covering the WPA, which was in response to a request made when he testified here. It is a letter dated May 26, 1941, addressed to you.

Mr. Del Guercio: I object to it being accepted in evidence on the ground that there is a regulation of the statutes.

Presiding Inspector: It doesn't add anything to the statute.

Mr. Grossman: I will offer it for identification, if there is any question, as that will do the job.

Presiding Inspector: It may be marked for identification.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

(The letter referred to was marked for identification as Alien's Exhibit No. 30.)

Mr. Grossman: Your Honor, I wonder if you have made up your mind in any way on the question that arose just before we adjourned with reference to this Chapter in the book that [5463] I asked Mr. Bridges about?

Presiding Inspector: Yes, I have. What was the question?

Mr. Grossman: The question was, in substance: Does Chapter 1 of this book, purporting to show the official position of the IWW at the time you joined the IWW, correctly state what you believed at that time was the official position of the IWW?

Presiding Inspector: I will exclude it. I will exclude the question under the objection of Mr. Del Guercio.

Mr. Goodwin: There is something you said about that—

Mr. Del Guercio: (Interposing) He has already ruled.

Presiding Inspector: The witness may himself tell—in fact, I find nothing in the book of any significance.

Direct Examination (Resumed)

By Mr. Grossman:

Q. Mr. Bridges, do you now believe in sabotage?

A. No.

Q. Do you now believe in the unlawful damage, injury, or destruction of property? A. No.

Q. Have you ever believed in sabotage?

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

A. No, sir.

Q. Have you ever believed in the unlawful damage, injury or destruction of property?

A. No. [5464]

Mr. Goodwin: Suppose that it has—

Mr. Myron: (Interposing) Just a minute.

By Mr. Grossman:

Q. Mr. Bridges, at the time you joined the IWW did you believe that it was the policy of the IWW to favor sabotage?

A. I didn't; I knew it wasn't. [5465]

Q. At the time you joined the IWW did you believe it was the policy of the IWW to favor unlawful damage, injury or destruction of property?

A. No.

Q. Mr. Bridges, a Mr. Diner testified in this hearing. You were present, were you not, during the entire testimony.

A. I was.

Q. Among other things Mr. Diner stated in his testimony that he had met you for the first time at your Union office. Will you state whether that is true or not true according to your best recollection.

A. I have no recollection of such meeting.

Q. Do you state that no such meeting did take place?

A. A lot of people come to my Union office, or did at that time. I heard his testimony. I have no recollection.

Q. Mr. Diner also stated that he had once met you at your home. Is that statement true or not true?



(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges)

A. He has never been in my home. I am positive of that.

Q. Mr. Diner stated that after meeting you at your home he met you again at your Union office. Can you state whether that statement is true or not true?

A. It's possible. I have——

Presiding Inspector: (Interposing) Shouldn't he give his own testimony on this rather than——

[5466]

Mr. Grossman: (Interposing) I think I have a right to negative as well, your Honor, so that there is no question about the negation of the testimony of the Government. I don't want it to be said that perhaps his testimony doesn't completely cover——

Presiding Inspector: (Interposing) It is not as effective as though he gave his own testimony.

Mr. Grossman: I intend to go into that, but I want to negative it also:

Presiding Inspector: We can't go into it twice. If you negative it that is all there is to it. Go ahead. I mean, you can't go into it on account of the delay that it would take, not because it wouldn't be material.

By Mr. Grossman:

Q. Did you attend a Communist Convention in Fresno in December of 1934? A. No.

Q. Did you attend a Communist Convention in Fresno at any time? A. No.

Q. Have you attended a Communist Convention anywhere at any time? A. No.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Q. Did you attend any convention on or around Christmas time of 1934 in Fresno? [5467]

Mr. Del Guercio: That has been asked and answered., I object to it.

Presiding Inspector: May I have the question, please?

(The question referred to was read by the reporter as above recorded.)

Presiding Inspector: I will take it again. This is specific. I say, this is a specific question.

Mr. Grossman: This is different.

By Mr. Grossman:

Q. Did you attend any convention in Fresno around Christmas time in 1934?

A. I was never in Fresno in my life until late in '35.

Q. Will you state what your relationship with Mr. Diner has been, if any?

A. So slight I can't even recall it. I knew him when he came into the Court room, but that's all.

Q. Do you remember any conversation that you have ever had with Mr. Diner?

Mr. Del Guercio: I will object to that, if your Honor please, unless it is something at issue in the case. "Any conversation."

Presiding Inspector: Well, I will take it as bearing on [5468] the general question.

A. I remember a dispute once that that Union was in and I remember a delegation coming down to see us to seek help. I have a recollection that Din-

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

er might have been in the delegation, but I am not positive. I mean, coming down to my Union office, on the waterfront seeking help from our Union on the waterfront.

Presiding Inspector: Can you remember when that was?

The Witness: I'm trying to. I think that it's—it would be, I think it was following the 1934 strike. During the—

Presiding Inspector: (Interposing) What is your best recollection?

The Witness: Well, the reason I can recall what the incident was, was during the intense period of organization after the strike and this particular Union or this particular delegation that somehow I connect Diner up with, was seeking help on some Union dispute, and it would be about that time.

By Mr. Grossman:

Q. In December of 1934 did you hold any Union position?

A. I was President of the Local Union.

Q. Did you hold any other Union position at that time?

A. No. Committeeman—I might have been a member of a delegated body or member of a committee, but any salaried official position, that was the only position. [5469]

Q. Were you in New York in the winter of 1934-35—to be more specific, let us say between October 1 and April 30, October 1, 1934 and April 30, 1935?

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

A. No. The first time I was in New York since 1921 was July, 1935?

Q. At any time have you been in the building which Mr. Thompson stated he was elevator operator in?

A. Never, never in my life.

Q. How did you happen to go to New York in July of 1935?

A. To attend an International Convention of the International Longshoremen's Association. [5470]

Q. Mr. Bridges, have you at any time, before appearing here, made any examination of your activities during this period of October '34 to April 1935, which tend to show where you were during the various days included in that period?

A. I have.

Mr. Del Guercio: I object to the form of the question. I think the witness should be asked the question, rather than what examination he made.

Presiding Inspector: I will take that.

By Mr. Grossman:

Q. What examination has been made, Mr. Bridges?

A. I have examined various records, official records, minutes, correspondence, and so forth, dealing with all my activities over that period of time.

Mr. Del Guercio: I move that the answer be stricken, if your Honor please. If the witness is testifying regarding any records he should produce the records.

Presiding Inspector: I will let it stand.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

By Mr. Grossman:

Q. Will you state what is the largest—withdraw that. Will you state what is the longest period of time which you are unable to account for in that examination you have made for the period from October 1, 1934 to April 30, 1935?

A. I have official union records to show I wasn't away from San Francisco more than any two days at one time. [5471]

Mr. Del Guercio: I move that the answer be stricken and that the records be produced.

The Witness: I might say, of course, the records I refer to, they are a lot of records, union minutes, correspondence; they are dues receipt books, they are various accounts of trips I have taken that show where I was, and any specific date at that time, any two days all during that time, with the exception maybe of a Sunday, any specific date that is named I can show that I was in San Francisco by the official records.

Mr. Del Guercio: I still move that the answer be stricken.

Presiding Inspector: I think I will let it stand.

Mr. Del Guercio: What?

Presiding Inspector: I will let it stand. We are ruling rather liberally here, you know.

Mr. Del Guercio: The records, from the witness' own mouth, are available.

Presiding Inspector: Your objection stands. You may cross examine on it.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

By Mr. Grossman:

Q. Have you ever gone to New York by plane?

A. I have.

Q. When was the first time?

A. July 1935.

Q. You are sure of that?

A. Positive of it. [5472]

Q. How many times in your life have you been in 121 Haight Street, San Francisco, or, rather, a building which has that number?

A. To the best of my recollection, two.

Q. Will you describe those two occasions?

A. Two occasions in 1934; one, the first time, in connection with an investigation into the aid offered by the International Labor Defense; and later on, around the end of May, or it might have been in the beginning of July, during one of the riots on the waterfront, as they called them at that time, when a lot of people were shot and beaten.

Only those two occasions. I have no recollection —As a matter of fact, I am certain that I was not there any other time.

Q. Do you know whether 121 Haight Street was the headquarters of the Communist Party on those two occasions?

A. I don't think it was.

Q. Have you any recollection of ever being at the home of Dawn Lovelace? A. Yes.

Q. Will you describe the circumstances surrounding your going to her home?



(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

A. I went there with a couple of other members of our union to have her do some typing.

Q. Was Hugh Adams one of those? [5473]

A. Hughie Adams was the man that took me.

Q. Did you know Dawn Lovelace before that?

A. Never met her; never met her since until she appeared here.

Q. Whose suggestion was it that you go to her house? A. Adams'.

Q. How did he happen to suggest—did you ask him for something, or for suggestions as to someone?

A. I don't remember. I needed some work done at that time. I needed to have some typing done. It was at night. I think I was leaving early in the morning and I wanted to leave the material behind, or something like that.

Q. Can you fix the date of that?

A. The date she fixed would be about correct; the week of August 12th to the 16th, because we were holding a District Executive Board meeting, as they called it, in Portland at that time, shortly after I had been to Washington, D. C.

Q. Do you know whether Richard Lovelace was there that evening?

A. I don't remember really.

Q. Do you know Richard Lovelace?

A. No; I can't place him at all.

Q. Do you know whether James Murphy was there that evening?

A. I don't recall that. [5474]

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Q. Do you know whether you have ever met James Murphy?

A. I have no recollection of meeting him.

Q. Do you know whether you ever met Richard Lovelace?

A. I have no recollection of ever meeting him. It is possible he was there that night; I don't recall it.

Q. Do you remember whether any telegram was sent by you during the time that you were at Dawn Lovelace's house, or shortly afterwards?

A. I sent a telegram at that time.

Q. When you say "at that time," what time is included?

A. I mean during the time I was in Portland; but whether I sent it that night or not I can't recall. I can check and find the date that that telegram was sent, I believe. But I know the circumstances surrounding the telegram and why it was sent, and who it was sent to.

Q. Will you please explain to whom it was sent, and why it was sent, and what it said?

A. It was sent to the Acting President of the local in San Francisco during my absence, a man by the name of Jack Creary—C-r-e-a-r-y—and it had to do with an issue that we were discussing on the Executive Board; and it was my instructions to the local to participate in a vote. The Executive Board had ruled the other way and instructed the local in a different way under the threat of revocation of their charter. [5475]

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Q. Which Executive Board?

A. The District Executive Board at that time. The issue was concerning a boycott we had on all cargo going to British Columbia due to a strike up there where we had voted by secret ballot not to handle any cargo destined for British Columbia. All the maritime unions, through the organization that embraced the maritime unions, the Maritime Federation, were going to vote, and they were going to vote as a Federation. Our particular union took the position that we should vote separately and apart from the others. I instructed the local to vote with the other unions as a part of the Federation, and the telegram was my instructions to the local President, who was acting as President in my absence. [5476]

Q. When had you first taken the position which was expressed in the telegram?

Mr. Del Guercio: I will object to that, your Honor, as immaterial, what was the statement.

Presiding Inspector: I will take it. I think it is an explanation of the transaction.

A. Back in Washington, D. C., before I ever returned to Portland.

By Mr. Grossman:

Q. Approximately how long before?

A. A week or ten days. And also on the Executive Board meeting, I think it's a matter of record in the official minutes as to my position, where I was recorded as to my position as against the other members of the Executive Board on that matter.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Q. Do you remember any more about going to Dawn Lovelace's house than you have now testified to?

A. No. It was purely incidental and the only purpose was for the purpose I stated.

Q. Did you seek or receive any advice from anyone at Dawn Lovelace's house that evening?

A. I can't see anybody around there that could give me any advice on that subject matter.

Q. Did you seek any?

A. No. I don't seek advice on those matters.

[5477]

Q. Have you ever sought trade union or other types of advice from James Murphy?

A. Never.

Q. Have you ever sought trade union or other types of advice from Dick Lovelace?

A. Never.

Q. Have you ever received trade union or other types of instructions from either of those men?

A. No.

Q. Do you recall Mr. Kelley's testifying here?

A. Yes.

Q. To refresh your recollection he stated in substance that he was present in the hotel room of Dietrich when you were also present and, in substance, you stated according to him something like this to Dietrich: That "someday you'll be glad to belong to a 'Commie' outfit." Do you remember the—withdraw that. Did anything like what Mr. Kelley testified to take place?

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

A. It's entirely possible. If you mean was I ever in Dietrich's room having a drink or more, or more than a drink, it is certainly possible. I can distinctly recall many such occasions.

Q. Now, is it possible that you made any such statement?

A. It's possible that many such statements were made with a little different twist or a little different construc- [5478] tion on them. Dietrich was the type of person—he was well known for it—that was always wise-cracking and kidding about the Communist Party.

Mr. Myron: Is this responsive, your Honor?

Mr. Grossman: Yes, this is responsive.

Presiding Inspector: I think so. Broadly so, not very closely responsive.

Go ahead.

By Mr. Grossman:

Q. Continue.

Presiding Inspector: It will only take time.

A. It was not unusual. As a matter of fact, it was a regular thing for Dietrich to make statements such as "Well, I think I'll join the Communist Party today." Or, "How about us both going up and joining?" Or he would introduce me to somebody and say "Meet this Communist. He has left his bombs home today." Over a period of time that I was associated with Dietrich many, many such remarks were made like that. The text of the remarks that I heard here, I don't recall that any such remarks and particularly that form.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

By Mr. Grossman:

Q. Will you state whether you made any such remark as is attributed to you by Mr. Kelley seriously, if you made it? [5479]

Mr. Myron: I object to that, your Honor.

Mr. Grossman: He is able to state from his state of mind whether he could have made such remark seriously.

Presiding Inspector: I think I will take it. There is no other way that that can be shown.

A. I don't think I made such a remark in the first place. If I did, it was certainly not seriously.

By Mr. Grossman:

Q. At that time did you belong to any Communist outfit? A. No.

Q. Or any Communist organization?

A. No.

Q. Or the Communist Party? A. No.

Q. Do you remember having any contacts with Mr. Kelley or any representative of his on the question of a CIO Union for hotel employees?

A. Yes.

Q. Will you state what you recall on that question?

A. I received at least one visit and one telephone call from Mr. Kelley. I received a letter also, as I recollect it, but I have been unable to find it in our files. I also received a visit from a woman closely connected with Mr. Kelley, who told me that she was working with him on the [5480] question of



(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

certain arrangements and understandings he wanted to make.

Q. What happened in the various conversations you had with Mr. Kelley?

Mr. Del Guercio: Well, your Honor, conversations with whom?

The Reporter: Mr. Kelley.

Mr. Grossman: Mr. Kelley.

A. Kelley was running a second-rate hotel. His hotel help was organized in the American Federation of Labor. He was complaining bitterly that he should not be required to pay the same amount of wages or work the help the same amount of hours as the larger first-rate hotels; that it was unfair to him. And he came to me with a proposition, and the woman likewise, that the Hotel Owners Association that he belonged to could exercise such influence to put all the employees in the second and third-rate hotels in the CIO Union if I would grant a charter to such Union, on the condition that the wages and the hours for such employees in second and third-rate hotels would be lower and longer. The proposition was refused.

By Mr. Grossman:

Q. Who refused it?

A. I did.

Q. Definitely?

A. Very definitely, and notified the American Federation [5481] of Labor Union, just as to what he was trying to accomplish up there.

Q. Do you remember where this telephone conversation took place?

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

A. In our International Union Office in Seattle, Washington, Arcade Building.

Q. Do you remember where, if anywhere, you received a letter from him—no, I mean, a visit from him?

A. In that same office.

Q. Mr. Bridges, do you remember the testimony of Mr. Wilmot with respect to an alleged meeting in the Lennox Hotel? In substance, Mr. Wilmot stated that you were present at the beginning of a meeting or just before a meeting began. Were you present at the beginning of a meeting or just before a meeting in the Lennox Hotel, as described by Mr. Wilmot?

A. No.

Q. Were you present at any meeting in the Lennox Hotel in the month of April, 1938 at which there was discussed or was to be discussed the question of removing Brost from his position in the CIO in Oregon?

A. No. I wasn't in Portland at that time.

Q. Did you ever ask Robert Wilmot whether he had been a Trotzkyite?

Presiding Inspector: A what?

Mr. Grossman: Trotzkyite. That was the testimony of [5482] Robert Wilmot.

Mr. Del Guercio: Well, if your Honor please—

Mr. Grossman: (Interposing) The objection is apparently to Mr. Wilmot's testimony because that is his. I am just negating it or explaining it or discussing his testimony.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Presiding Inspector: If you say there was such a question—

Mr. Grossman: (Interposing) Oh, yes, there was. I have taken over the language of Mr. Wilmot's testimony.

Presiding Inspector: All right. You may ask Mr. Bridges about it.

A. I'm not sure. I might have.

By Mr. Grossman:

Q. Can you explain why you say you "might have"?

A. I think he stated he came from Minneapolis and had been active in the labor movement there, and the last person I had a little experience with that came from the same place and had been active there and was also a newspaperman, why, he was a Trotzkyite and pretty much of a disrupter and wrecker.

Q. What was his name?

A. Barney Maas.

Q. And what was your contact with Barney Maas?

A. He was the editor of the Voice of the Federation until he was removed. [5483]

Q. Why was he removed?

Mr. Myron: Is it material, your Honor?

Mr. Grossman: Certainly it is material. This is a very strange circumstance. The Government apparently thinks it is important—I don't know why or how, but apparently they think it is important—that Mr. Bridges is charged by Mr. Wil-

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

not with asking someone whether he is a Trotzkyite. Now, therefore they object when I show that if Mr. Bridges discussed that with him he doesn't recall it.

Presiding Inspector: I have allowed it.

Mr. Grossman: The objection has been made. Are we free to go into this, your Honor?

Presiding Inspector: In respect to conversations?

Mr. Grossman: No. With respect to the experience Mr. Bridges had with a man who claimed he was a Trotzkyite. That is what I mean.

Presiding Inspector: To define what Mr. Bridges thought was meant by—what was it? A Trotzkyite?

Mr. Grossman: Thought of Trotzkyites and why.

Presiding Inspector: It is a little remote, but I will take it.

Mr. Grossman: It is no more remote than the Government testimony, your Honor. They brought it in. If it is remote they shouldn't have been permitted to introduce such testimony. [5484]

Presiding Inspector: No. I think the conversation with Mr. Maas is a little—is his name Maas?

Mr. Grossman: Maas.

Presiding Inspector: I think that is a little remote. Does Mr. Maas' name occur in any way?

Mr. Grossman: Yes.

Mr. Myron: He has been asked the question and he has answered the question. Apparently now they

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

are going into some sort of conversation he had with some other individual.

Mr. Grossman: I want to go into what there was about Mr. Maas that caused Mr. Bridges to form what opinion he then had of Trotzkyites. That is all.

Presiding Inspector: This is really to define what Mr. Bridges meant by the word "Trotzkyite."

Mr. Myron: The question was, Did he have such a conversation? And the witness said "he might have."

Mr. Grossman: That is not the question.

Presiding Inspector: The purpose of the question is as I have indicated. To define the word "Trotzkyite" as used by Mr. Bridges.

I will take it.

Mr. Grossman: The question was, Why was he removed as editor of the Voice of the Federation.

Presiding Inspector: Well, I don't think we ought to [5485] go into the capacity of Barney Maas.

Mr. Grossman: Because his removal and the cause of his removal are behind the opinion of Mr. Bridges. I can ask him the preliminary question, and I will ask it this way:

Q. Did the removal of Mr. Maas as editor of the Voice of the Federation and the reason for such removal have anything to do with the opinion you held in 1938 on Trotzkyites? A. It did.

Q. Why was Mr. Maas removed?

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

A. He was the editor of our Maritime paper, the Voice of the Federation. He first of all procured the job under forged references and credentials. When I say, "forged" I mean that he presented references showing that he had worked on other newspapers. The check-up revealed that he had never worked there.

After coming in, or after becoming the editor, much of the stuff he printed in the paper was very disruptive, and eventually in the middle of the strike he almost wrecked our strike by erroneous news reports that had a very bad effect on our entire strike before it was half over, such as making reports that the strike was about to end, that settlements had been reached. Not only were there no settlements in sight but some of the Unions hadn't even met with the employers to negotiate a settlement, and it had a very bad effect all the way around. [5486]

It ultimately resulted in us taking action to give him a trial and move to remove him from his post. He resigned before the decision was put into effect. And his history in this connection is well known and he used to announce himself as a follower of Trotzky, although that had nothing to do in this particular instance with his removal. He wasn't removed because he was a Trotzkyite, but removed because of his disruptive and practically strike-breaking activities in this respect. [5487]

Presiding Inspector: I think you have gone pretty far afield. You have now proved he didn't



(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

have anything to do with Trotzkyism. I suppose Trotzkyism is a well recognized left wing branch of the Communists.

Mr. Grossman: Under the theory of the Government's position, and of course I have to interpret it myself because they didn't explain it, they think that, make the point that one must be a Communist to oppose Trotzkyites, because some people have a theory that one must be a Communist to oppose Trotzkyites; otherwise there would be no sense in the Government asking the question.

That being their theory I intend to show that Mr. Bridges' opposition was based on the fact that Mr. Maas, who announced himself as a Trotzkyite, took a very disruptive role, played a very disruptive role, as editor of this publication, and was removed because of that; and the attitude of Mr. Bridges toward such people is based on such trade union experience, and not, as the Government would apparently contend, based on the fact that they allege Mr. Bridges is a Communist.

Presiding Inspector: Trotzky is a Communist.

Mr. Gladstein: What?

Presiding Inspector: Trotzky is a Communist.

Mr. Gladstein: I don't think he is any longer.

Presiding Inspector: He isn't now, because he is dead, but his criticism of the Russian Government is that they are not [5488] Communists; that they have given way and become State Socialists.

Trotzky is, or was a Communist. I think we can take judicial notice of that, I suppose.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

By Mr. Grossman:

Q. Did you ever tell Wilmot to use the Labor New Dealer, of which he was editor, to get Helmig—H-e-l-m-i-g—and Hartung—H-a-r-t-u-n-g?

Mr. Gladstein: That is H-e-l-m-i-c-k.

By Mr. Grossman:

Q. Will you answer the question?

A. I believe I did—

Mr. Del Guercio (Interposing): Will you read the question?

(The question referred to was read by the reporter as above recorded.)

A. I believe I did, in the sense that I instructed him to use the paper to expose their activities.

By Mr. Grossman:

Q. What were their activities you wanted exposed?

Mr. Del Guercio: If your Honor please, I will object to questions along this line.

Mr. Grossman: I call your Honor's attention to the testimony of Wilmot on that question. Mr. Wilmot attempted to create the implication—you will find it in the same sentence where he testified—that Mr. Bridges told him to get Helmick and Hartung because they were waging an anti-Communist campaign there. [5489] If you will find the reference you will see that is true. Though he didn't state it too clearly, he intended to convey the implication that Bridges was out to get

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

these men—that was the implication—because they were attacking the Communist Party.

We intend to show that Mr. Bridges might have said that, because he was interested in exposing their activities, but we wish to show why he was interested in exposing them and why he opposed them, and it wasn't the reason implied by Mr. Wilmot.

Presiding Inspector: I will take it.

Mr. Del Guercio: It wasn't Mr. Wilmot's implication. It was Mr. Wilmot's testimony.

Presiding Inspector: I will take it.

A. Their general activities—they were very disruptive, they were breaking the union, they were embarking on all forms of action that could have no successful results, could only result in defeat. They were very definitely placing our particular organization in many positions that were untenable, and the net result of the whole thing was that the movement, the labor movement in that part of the State, that is the Columbia River basin, was falling to pieces because of the activities of the group headed by these two people, Helmick and Hartung, and still is for that matter.

By Mr. Grossman:

Q. Has any convention of the International Longshoremen's [5490] and Warehousemen's Union condemned the activities of Helmick and Hartung, or the group they led?

Mr. Del Guercio: I will object to that, no time and place given.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Presiding Inspector: I will take it. I suppose it is to show the general picture.

A. Two conventions.

By Mr. Grossman:

Q. Which conventions and when?

A. The '40 and the '41 Conventions; 1940 and 1941 Conventions.

Q. Of which organization?

A. International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union.

Q. The national organization or the district organization?

A. The international organization.

Q. Did Mr. Helmick and Mr. Hartung carry on any activities that affected the longshoremen in Portland or in any other parts of the coast?

A. Very definitely; at numerous times.

Q. What were these activities that affected the longshoremen?

A. Well, particularly a disruptive form of activity was, for example, in a small logging or lumber camp a hundred miles inland from the waterfront, they would declare a strike. They would not even have sufficient strength to pull a majority of the [5491] workers in that plant out on strike against the plant. They could only pull a minority. Then they would declare the products of that particular plant or mill as unfair. They would remove their picket line 100 miles inland down on the waterfront and demand that we refuse to handle that cargo. It happened on numerous occasions where,

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

on more than one occasion, the entire port was locked out for days because of activity of that kind; and because, in trying to support such things, we would be in violation of our contract and as a result would be locked out; even approaching on one distinct occasion, I can recall, a coastwise lock-out.

Q. In April of 1938 what was your position with reference to the continuation of Mr. Brost in his CIO position in Oregon?

A. I was in favor of his continuation.

Q. What was his position?

A. He was a field representative attached to the CIO regional office for the State of Oregon.

Q. How did he obtain that position?

A. I appointed him. The final power was not in my hands.—I was given authority to recommend appointments to the national office of the CIO, and generally, without any exception that I can recall, those appointments were approved. I recommended the appointment of Brost and he was approved.

Q. Did you have the authority in April, 1938, to remove John Brost from his position? [5492]

A. I did.

Q. Now, will you state generally whether, in April of 1938, you, as CIO Director for the Pacific Coast, were engaged in a procedure of increasing or decreasing the size of the CIO, the number of the CIO representatives on the Pacific Coast?

A. I was engaged in decreasing them.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Q. Can you give some examples indicating the extent to which such decreasing went on, and the approximate dates?

Mr. Myron: How is that material, your Honor?

Presiding Inspector: Yes; how is it material?

Mr. Grossman: We will show this, your Honor: We will show that not only did Mr. Bridges specifically refuse, when called upon by various union representatives, to remove Mr. Brost—Mr. Wilmot claimed he wanted to get rid of him—but he did this despite the fact that he was operating under orders from the national office of the CIO to cut down his forces, that he cut off valuable forces in other parts of the Pacific Coast and left Mr. Brost there. We are going to show that he was given full authority to cut off anyone he wanted to cut off on the Pacific Coast, and despite that fact he kept Mr. Brost on until later—certainly indicating the contrary of what Mr. Wilmot's testimony was that Mr. Bridges wanted to get rid of Mr. Brost.

Presiding Inspector: The only way, as I understand it, that there is any indication that Mr. Bridges wanted to get rid [5493] of Mr. Brost was through a statement made by a man named Ring.

Mr. Grossman: Either that testimony is relevant or it is not. If it is relevant it is because there is supposed to be some credibility about this hearsay or double hearsay. In other words, if that goes in, if it has any relevancy, it is only because it is supposed to show the attitude of Mr.



(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Bridges in agreeing to the faction meeting and agreeing to its decision; otherwise, we move it be stricken. If it is relevant we intend to show—if there is any claim of relevance—that it shows the attitude of Mr. Bridges toward a faction meeting on removing Mr. Brost. If it is relevant for that purpose we intend to show that the state of mind of Mr. Bridges was entirely and completely in conflict with that testimony. In fact, they aren't reconcilable at all.

Mr. Del Guercio: If your Honor please, Mr. Ring is available; he is still living and at one time was Mr. Bridges' bodyguard. Certainly he can be brought down here to testify.

Presiding Inspector: I don't believe that is necessary.

I will take this, although I think there are other explanations of it.

Mr. Grossman: I don't think they are reconcilable at all. Our position is they are not.

By Mr. Grossman:

Q. Would you state generally what were your activities shortly before and during April, 1938, with respect to increasing [5494] or decreasing the number of CIO representatives on the Pacific Coast?

Presiding Inspector: Doesn't that only support, by his own statement, what he has already testified to, that he was in favor of keeping Mr. Brost?

Mr. Grossman: Of course, it supports it.

Presiding Inspector: What difference does it

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

make—all these underlying things? We cannot go into the reason for all these things. He has testified that he could remove Brost—and practically according to the testimony of other witnesses here—he has given his statement that he was opposed to it. As I understand it, he voted against it, or expressed himself that way. That is already in the testimony. Why do we have to go into his authority with the CIO?

MR. GROSSMAN: Until your Honor states that he does not believe a word of Mr. Wilmot's testimony, we think we have a right to prove everything which confirms and corroborates the testimony of Mr. Bridges on this point, and we think we have a right to prove it right up to the hilt.

Presiding Inspector: You haven't a right to prove—

MR. GROSSMAN (Interposing): That corroborates—

Presiding Inspector: That substantially corroborates it, but you don't get any corroboration in this way because it is already admitted he had the power to remove Mr. Brost.

MR. GROSSMAN: But it has not been admitted that he kept [5495] Mr. Brost on at the expense of other valuable organizers, and at the expense of the policy of the CIO to cut down as much as possible.

Presiding Inspector: What difference does that make?

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Mr. Grossman: If we can get a stipulation now that Mr. Bridges was not of the state of mind that he wanted to remove Mr. Brost, if we can get that stipulation, I will stop here and now. But the Government has presented a case which relies in part on the theory that Mr. Bridges wanted to get rid of Mr. Brost; that Mr. Bridges said, in substance, "I approve this fraction meeting and I want the fraction meeting to decide in favor of getting rid of Mr. Brost, and I will do that." That is the substance of their testimony, their claim.

Presiding Inspector: He denies all that.

Mr. Grossman: He is entitled to do more than deny it—unless your Honor is satisfied—he is entitled to show it is impossible and inconsistent with his activities publicly known.

Presiding Inspector: We cannot go into all his activities to show that. If I exclude this it is simply on the remoteness. It seems to me that you have got everything that you can have. But if you insist on it, if you insist on it, I will take it.

Mr. Grossman: We do.

By Mr. Grossman: [5496]

Q. Will you state—

Presiding Inspector: You then claim that you haven't sufficiently supported this witness by his statement?

Mr. Grossman: I will say we haven't proved it up to the hilt, which we now want to do. I will state that, though I think we have proof.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Presiding Inspector: Go ahead.

Mr. Grossman: Have you the last question? I will rephrase the question.

By Mr. Grossman:

Q. Mr. Bridges, what was being done in the month of April, 1936, and the previous few months, with respect to increasing or decreasing the number of CIO representatives under your control on the Pacific Coast?

Presiding Inspector: Now, I think you ought to prove that in some other way than by the oath of this witness. Did he receive communications to that effect?

Mr. Grossman: Yes.

Presiding Inspector: Then let's have those.

(Whereupon Mr. Grossman searched his files.)

Presiding Inspector: I don't mean it is necessary for you to produce the document, but instead of giving his opinion, state what he received.

Mr. Grossman: I beg your pardon. Though I have letters, I will do it the shorter way. [5497]

By Mr. Grossman:

Q. Mr. Bridges, what instructions, if any, did you receive from the national office of the CIO early in 1938, or before that time, with respect to increasing or decreasing the CIO representatives on the Pacific Coast?

A. Early in the fall of 1937 I received almost weekly written instructions from the national CIO

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

office to reduce the forces down to the absolute minimum along the entire Pacific Coast, in all the territory that I was at that time in charge of—all the Western States.

Q. Can you estimate how many CIO representatives there were under your control at the time you first received instructions from the CIO to cut down. A. Around 45.

Q. Can you estimate the number of CIO representatives there were under your control in the middle of April of 1938? A. About eight.

Q. Will you state how many CIO representatives there were under your control at the time Mr. Brost was laid off?

A. I couldn't be too sure; I would have to check the records. I think around five. I am narrowing that down to CIO representatives. There were other people on the payroll. But when you say "representatives" that designates a particular office.

Q. That is correct. Well, when you stated "45," were [5498] you referring to CIO representatives?

A. Yes; yes.

Q. In other words, you were using the same term to describe the individuals when you testified to 45, to 8, and to 5?

A. Yes. A CIO representative in effect is an organizer.

Q. Do you remember a meeting in the Roosevelt Hotel approximately April 20, 1938, in your room, or anyone's room at which were present you,

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Pilcher, Harry Pilcher, Harry Jackson and Wilmot? A. April 20?

Q. Approximately that.

A. I don't remember a meeting, but it is entirely possible I was in the hotel at that time.

Q. Do you remember a meeting with any of those individuals in the Roosevelt Hotel at about that time? A. No.

Q. Did you ever, in a meeting where Wilmot was present, state in substance, or in words, "We Communists must stick together"?

A. No.

Q. Have you ever made that statement to anyone, anywhere, at any time? A. No. [5499]

Q. Do you remember ever having a discussion with Mr. Wilmot with respect to whether or not official press releases or statements from the Communist Party, should be printed in the Labor New Dealer?

A. I can't specifically remember any such.

Q. Will you state what was your position in approximately April of 1936 with respect to whether or not the Labor New Dealer should print official press releases or statements of the Communist Party?

A. That would depend. I have no specific recollection of any instances at that time. [5500]

Q. You mean that would depend upon the—  
Mr. Myron (Interposing): He has answered the question. Is this the meaning of counsel?

Presiding Inspector: Yes. I think he has



(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

answered the question. If he wants to explain, he may.

The Witness: As I understand, the question was my position in regard to printing official Communist releases. I still say it might depend. For example if—there was a lot of trouble up there at that time, a lot of action and tieups. I believe that if the Communist Party happened to send in a statement saying that they would do everything they could to support the particular dispute at that time in behalf of the Union position, my position would be that I wouldn't have any great objection to seeing that carried in the Union paper. That would be my position even now, maybe.

By Mr. Grossman:

Q. Have you ever taken the position that under no circumstances should any official press release or statement of the Communist Party be printed in a trade union paper?

A. No, I haven't; not generally speaking, no.

Q. Did you ever order Wilmot to run statements of the Communist Party in the Labor New Dealer?

A. Not that I recall.

Q. Did you ever state to Wilmot in substance at approximately the time that the Strecker decision came down from the Supreme Court "Now is our chance. The Communist [5501] Party is coming into the open around here"?

A. No.

Mr. Myron: What was the answer?

The Reporter: "No".

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

By Mr. Grossman:

Q. Did you ever have a discussion with Wilmot with respect to his being appointed in the place of Brost as CIO representative?

A. Not at all.

Q. Did you ever consider the question of Wilmot taking the place of Brost as CIO representative in Oregon?

A. In no way.

Q. Do you remember any conversation that you ever had with Wilmot outside of those you may have testified to?

A. I told him we had no use for him at one time unless he would quit drinking.

Q. When was that?

A. I told him if he didn't get around and get the paper out and make it some kind of a paper that could be used, we had no use for him. We had no money to waste on him in the CIO.

Q. How did this conversation take place?

A. I don't remember when it was, but I recall such a conversation on at least one occasion during one of my trips to Portland where it was getting pretty widely known that he was irresponsible, he was drinking, the paper wasn't getting [5502] out on time, it was a hit-and-miss affair. We were short of funds and I distinctly recall telling him that.

Q. Was there any occasion when the CIO was asked to put up funds, the National CIO, to subsidize the Labor New Dealer?

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Mr. Myron: I will object to that, your Honor.

Presiding Inspector: I will take it.

A. Yes. Over a wide—over quite a period of time the CIO was asked to subsidize that paper and other activities in Oregon.

By Mr. Grossman:

Q. Did you ever discuss that question with Wilmot?

A. No. That's possible. I might have. I don't recall. I discussed it with a lot of people in Oregon and I always supported the subsidization and made frequent recommendations to the National office of the CIO.

Q. In April of 1938 was Joe Ring in Oregon?

A. Yes.

Q. Do you know how he happened to go there?

A. I sent him there.

Q. Why did you send him there?

A. He was a CIO field representative and Oregon was crying for help. They needed help in the way of increased forces, they needed help in the way of technical help to get out publicity because Wilmot was laying down on the job, the [5503] reports I got. And it wound up with me dispatching our publicity man from San Francisco and our San Francisco organizer Ring to help out in Portland. And Ring and O'Neil were both up there—Jim O'Neil.

Q. O'Neil was your publicity man that you sent up there?

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

A. At that time, yes. I sent them up there to help out; took them from San Francisco.

Q. From whom did the request come for the sending to Oregon of aid?

A. The local CIO Council in Portland and the CIO Regional Director, Mr. E. B. O'Grady.

Q. For how long was Ring in Portland?

A. I can't quite recall. A few weeks; maybe a month or two; a couple of months, I think.

Q. How long was O'Neil in Portland?

A. A short period of time, I believe.

Q. Was O'Neil sent there to do publicity work exclusively?

A. Yes. That's what his job was.

Q. Did you ever attend any kind of a meeting at the Gowman Hotel on or about March or May of 1937?

A. In May, yes.

Q. What were you doing in Seattle in May of 1937?

A. Our convention was being held at that time.

Q. When did this meeting take place with relation to [5504] the convention?

A. During the convention.

Q. Will you state how you happened to go to that meeting?

A. I can't specifically recall. Dietrich and I went over. I think we were accompanied by Meehan. Dietrich and Matt Meehan and I went to the meeting at that time.

Q. Where was the meeting held in the Gowman Hotel?

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

A. It was in a dining room.

Q. A private or public dining room? I mean is it the kind of dining room where people come in from the street and eat?

A. No, I don't think it was. I think you might call it more of a private dining room. If I remember correctly there was—I recall some dishes and things on the table. I know we were drinking. There were some drinks there; beer and other drinks.

Q. Whom do you remember to be present at that meeting?

A. It is pretty hard to remember, but I do remember Rapport.

Q. You have named Dietrich, and you stated that you think Meehan was there. Can you name anyone else that was there or whom you believe was there?

A. I think Robertson—J. R. Robertson, the International Vice-President of the Union. I think Goldbatt [5505] was there.

Q. Were Meehan, Dietrich, Robertson and Goldblatt delegates to your convention?

A. Yes. They were all delegates, I think. They were definitely.

Q. Do you remember whether there was a Chairman at this meeting?

A. I don't remember. My impression is that there wasn't.

Q. Were most of the people there when you arrived? A. Oh, yes.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Q. Did you leave before the end?

A. I did.

Q. Withdraw that. Did you leave before most of the people left?

A. As I recall I did.

Q. With whom did you come to the meeting?

A. Dietrich and Meehan, I believe.

Q. With whom did you leave?

A. I think I left with Dietrich.

Q. What do you remember about that meeting?

A. Not a great deal. I remember a pretty-hot argument, but that's about all.

Q. Between whom was the hot argument?

A. Mainly between Dietrich and I and Rapport.

Q. Who was on which side? [5506]

A. Well, Dietrich and I generally used to get lined up together.

Q. I mean, were you lined up together at that time?

A. Yes.

Q. And who was on the other side of the argument?

A. I don't remember the individuals, but I distinctly remember Rapport.

Q. Was this Rapport Morris Rapport?

A. Morris Rapport who was at that time the Secretary or the head of the Communist Party in the State of Washington.

Q. Had you met Rapport before then?

A. Yes. I met him during the convention. That's the first time I had met him. I mean, not this particular time, but I met him before that meeting in the convention.



(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Q. Do you remember what this hot argument was about?

A. No. But I think—I have no definite recollection. I have a faint recollection that it was on the question of CIO and the activities of some unions in Seattle in regard to CIO affiliation or something like that.

Q. Was there anything formal about this meeting?

A. No, not that I can recall.

Q. Do you remember anyone saying "Mr. Chairman" or "Comrade Chairman" or "Miss Chairman"? Or any designation for a Chairman?

A. I don't. I am sure they didn't.

Q. Do you remember any motions being made?

[5507]

A. Not while I was there. As a matter of fact, now the recollection comes back to me. Everybody was talking at one time. I know the argument waxed pretty hot and Dietrich was the kind of person that was pretty loud talking and an energetic person and I wasn't missing any opportunities. I don't think there was any formality about the meeting whatsoever.

Q. Do you recall how long you were there?

A. No.

Q. Do you know how the meeting came into being?

A. No.

Q. Do you know how Rapport happened to be there?

A. I do not. I have tried to recollect, but it's pretty hard and it was more or less incidental. So I just can't remember.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Q. Do you recall anyone else being present that you now know or knew then was a Communist, except Rapport?

A. No, I don't. There was a lot of people there. I just can't recall. There were only two or three that stand out in my mind.

Q. Mr. Cannalonga stated that a Mr. Bristol was there. A. Who?

Q. Bristol, B-r-i-s-t-o-l. Do you know whether he was or not?

A. I don't think I know him. [5508]

Q. You don't know Mr. Bristol?

A. Not as far as I know.

Q. I believe his name is supposed to be Al Bristol and I believe also he is supposed to be an official of the Communist Party.

A. I don't know him.

Q. Do you know whether Harry Jackson was there?

A. I'm pretty sure he wasn't. I have no recollection at all of him being there.

Q. Was there any conclusion to the argument which you were involved in? In other words, did you reach an agreement with—did those who were arguing reach any agreement?

A. Not that I can remember of. If there had been some decision reached I might have remembered it, but I don't recall any agreement or decision being reached on anything now.

Q. How hot was this argument?

Mr. Del Guercio: Well, if your Honor please, that is a familiar term.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Presiding Inspector: I suppose that is a figure of speech.

Mr. Grossman: Yes. It has different meanings.

Presiding Inspector: He has given it pretty definitely. He told about their being noisy and so forth.

Mr. Del Guercio: I would suggest a substitution of the word "Red".

Mr. Grossman: Mr. Cannalonga has stated—

[5509]

Presiding Inspector: (Interposing) I suppose you will have your opportunity to argue the case at the end.

By Mr. Grossman:

Q. Mr. Cannalonga has stated that you were at a fraction meeting somewhere around the 1936 strike period with him in San Francisco, at which were present Schneidermann, Stack, Telford, Schmidt, Saunders, Brown and Pyle. Did you ever attend such a meeting? A. No.

Q. Did you ever attend a Communist Party fraction meeting with Cannalonga? A. No.

Q. Did you ever attend any kind of a Communist meeting with Cannalonga? A. No.

Q. Did you ever attend any kind of a Communist meeting with anyone, anywhere, any place?

A. No.

Mr. Grossman: May we have our morning intermission now, your Honor?

Presiding Inspector: Yes. A short recess.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

(Whereupon a short recess was taken.)

Presiding Inspector: We will proceed. Mr. Grossman.

By Mr. Grossman: [5510]

Q. Mr. Bridges, do you remember the testimony of Mr. Rushmore who stated that he had interviewed you in New York City? A. Yes.

Q. What were you doing in New York City at that time?

A. I was attending the International Convention of the International Longshoremen's Association.

Q. Did you speak at any meeting at the Madison Square Garden on that occasion?

A. No. I spoke at a meeting, but not at that place.

Q. Did you speak at any mass meeting on that occasion?

A. Yes. I think I spoke at a meeting at the Manhattan Opera House.

Q. What was the subject of the meeting?

A. Unemployed Insurance; Trade Union Unemployment Insurance, I believe.

Q. What did you speak on at that meeting?

A. I think I was asked to give a review of the happenings on the West Coast, the '34 strike and subsequent happenings.

Q. Is that what you spoke on?

A. As far as I can recall, yes. And I also spoke, of course, in support of the move for Unemployment Insurance, and I think another sub-

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

ject was at that meeting, Trade Union Democracy. [5511]

Q. When was the first time you met James O'Neil?

Mr. Del Guercio: Who?

Mr. Grossman: James O'Neil.

A. 1937.

By Mr. Grossman:

Q. Do you remember where you met him the first time? A. In my office.

Q. Did you meet James O'Neil at someone's home on New Year's Day? A. No.

Q. Were you ever introduced to James O'Neil as "Comrade Bridges"? A. No.

Q. Did you ever recommend to James O'Neil that he transfer from the Guild Fraction to the Waterfront Section of the Communist Party?

A. No.

Presiding Inspector: What is the point of all this?

Mr. Grossman: Well, I am just negating the alleged statement which Mr. O'Neil has denied. If your Honor feels it irrelevant—

Presiding Inspector: (Interposing) No, I don't say so. But I just want to get the point.

Mr. Grossman: That is the point. Do you consider it relevant? [5512]

Presiding Inspector: If you treat it as original proof, yes.

Mr. Grossman: Well, I don't know. I don't



(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

think it is. If it is, I want to deny the record, that is all, so your Honor might as well rule. I don't think it is proof. I just want it not to be said that we have failed to deny——

Presiding Inspector: (Interposing) I am not going to make a ruling on that at this time. It is a proposition I would like to have briefed.

Mr. Grossman: Well, I will ask him the questions, your Honor, but in asking the questions I am not admitting at all that it is original testimony.

Presiding Inspector: That is what I had in mind.

Mr. Grossman: I don't want it to appear that we haven't denied the statements.

Presiding Inspector: Very well.

Mr. Grossman: However, even if there is no evidence of it——

Presiding Inspector: (Interposing) I asked you with that very thought in mind. Of course, an argument can be made that what he says, whatever he did say there, was the truth and there is evidence that he did make these statements in dictation to Mrs. Segerstrom.

Mr. Grossman: Then I will continue to ask the questions with the understanding that by so doing I am not admitting [5513] that there is any evidence in the record or in the hearing on these questions.

Presiding Inspector: Yes. I think you ought to have that explanation on the record.



(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Mr. Del Guercio: Well, if your Honor please, what understanding is that? We say that there is such a statement. That statement has been proved beyond any doubt at all, that O'Neil made that statement.

Presiding Inspector: Then, of course, it is competent under your theory to permit Mr. Grossman to make this proof.

Mr. Del Guercio: Yes.

Presiding Inspector: That is the only way<sup>9</sup> he can protect himself, I suppose.

By Mr. Grossman:

Q. Did you ever tell James O'Neil that he had not been attending Communist Party meetings?

A. No.

Q. Did you ever have a meeting in the Balboa Building with Schneidermann, Cayton, Goldblatt and O'Neil? A. No, not that I recall.

Mr. Del Guercio: What is the answer?

The Witness: Not that I recall having met with Schneidermann in the Balboa Building.

By Mr. Grossman:

Q. Did you ever have a meeting with Schneidermann, Cayton, Goldblatt and O'Neil in the Balboa Building at which [5514] you discussed the Communist Party position on the CIO press and on the Sailor's Union of the Pacific?

Presiding Inspector: Will you take a short recess? I have a message.

(Whereupon a short recess was taken.)

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

By Mr. Grossman:

Q. Did you ever tell James O'Neil that you had participated in Communist fraction meetings?

A. No.

Q. Are you a member of the Communist Party?

A. No.

Q. Have you ever been? A. No.

Q. Are you affiliated with the Communist Party? A. No.

Q. Have you ever been? A. No.

Q. What trade union positions do you hold at the present time?

A. President of the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union; California Director for the CIO. That would be about all the main ones. I have various other minor positions.

Q. Do you hold any national position with the CIO?

A. Member of the Committee on Unemployment, member of [5515] the Pan-American Committee, or Latin-American Committee.

Q. Are you a member of the National Executive Board of the CIO?

A. Member of the National Executive Board of the CIO.

Q. What positions have you held in the past in the Maritime Federation?

A. For two years I believe I was President of the San Francisco Federation Council, District Council No. 2. That is the only real position.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Q. Have you ever been on the Executive Board of the Maritime Federation?

A. I was on the first Executive Board for a short while.

Q. What position have you held in your Local Union?

A. Executive Board member in 1934 and then President from 1934 to 1936.

Q. And after 1936 what positions did you hold, if any, in the ILA?

A. I was elected District President in 1936.

Q. District President of the ILA?

A. Of the ILA; that is, Pacific Coast District.

Q. And when did you become President of the ILWU? A. July, 1937.

Q. Was that the time that the ILA Pacific Coast District changed its affiliation to the CIO?

[5516]

A. That is right.

Q. Have you been District President since that time? A. Yes.

Q. Were you ever an international representative of the ILA? A. I was.

Q. When?

A. For a short while; July, 1936 to December, 1936.

Q. Were you ever a member of the State Executive Council of the A. F. of L.?

A. State of California, yes.

Q. What position would that be? Vice-President of the Federation of Labor?

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

A. State Vice-President.

Q. For what period did you hold that position?

A. I didn't serve a full term. It was in 1936. I was removed.

Q. Why were you removed?

A. Supporting CIO.

Q. Have you ever taken the position, Mr. Bridges, that it is impossible for the workers and employers to sit down to the table, bargain collectively in an amicable fashion and have it result in benefits for the workers?

Mr. Del Guercio: I will object to the question. It is irrelevant and immaterial. [5517]

Presiding Inspector: I will take it.

A. No.

Presiding Inspector: I will take it. It concerns his attitude.

By Mr. Grossman:

Q. What is your position on the value of collective bargaining, negotiating with employers and arbitration to the members of Unions?

Mr. Del Guercio: I will object to that, your Honor, on the same ground.

Presiding Inspector: Isn't that a pretty large question?

Mr. Grossman: I understand. But there is no sense starting at it in a small way. We will ultimately get into it in a large way. I may have misunderstood you, your Honor, but I understood you to say that when we were attempting—

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Presiding Inspector: (Interposing) Oh, I allowed that.

Mr. Grossman: I thought I understood you to say that Mr. Bridges could state more on his general views than such witnesses as Mr. Kagel and Dean Morse.

Presiding Inspector: I don't know, but you asked them so many question.

Mr. Grossman: No, I didn't get into this. I didn't get into Mr. Bridges' general views on collective bargaining. I don't think I did. But, anyhow, I want to now. [5518]

Presiding Inspector: Are these controversial matters, really, any longer?

Mr. Grossman: Well, I don't like to duplicate the argument we have had before, but I think—

Presiding Inspector: (Interposing) It would be shorter probably to take it. I will take it.

Mr. Grossman: I think so.

Presiding Inspector: It seems to me of slight importance.

By Mr. Grossman:

Q. Will you state your position on the value of collective bargaining, negotiations with employers and arbitration at certain times to the members of unions?

Mr. Del Guercio: If your Honor please, I want to object to that on another ground. We are getting into an argument here on the theory of the



(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

value of such matters not at issue even remotely in this proceedings.

Presiding Inspector: Well, I suppose if they have no value I wouldn't favor them. That would be the next question under those circumstances. I think I will take it. It is pretty general.

A. Collective bargaining is the fundamental issue underlying any organization of workers, of course. That is the primary purpose for which the workers are organized, following the organization of the workers in a group. Next [5519] comes collective bargaining in an attempt to secure an agreement, the agreement naturally embracing the rate of wages; the number of hours, seniority, vacations, the question of methods of hiring, working conditions and all the things that go into a collective bargaining agreement.

Of course, collective bargaining is brought about through methods of both negotiation, mediation and arbitration. I think they all run to the same term and you can't mention one without going into the other. Therefore, when you organize a union and then you engage in collective bargaining, to try and engage in collective bargaining without negotiations is silly and, likewise, without mediation or arbitration. It's equally ridiculous.

So the whole thing goes together and we have always supported such fundamental matters, and still do.

We can see how—we can't see how any headway



(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

can be made unless you do in so far as the trade union is concerned.

By Mr. Grossman:

Q. What is your position as to generally when and where strikes should be engaged in?

Mr. Del Guercio: I will object to that, if your Honor please, as being immaterial.

Presiding Inspector: Does this have anything to do with the issue we are trying? [5520]

Mr. Grossman: I believe it is the positive side of the negative testimony we have been giving through our expert witnesses and expect to give through Mr. Bridges. In other words, instead of merely asking him whether he has ever believed this sort of thing that I just read him a statement of, I think I am entitled to show positively what he believes.

Presiding Inspector: If you think it is material I will take it.

Mr. Grossman: Yes.

A. We only resort to strikes as a last resort, after we have exhausted the resources of negotiation, mediation and in many cases arbitration. There is this point, however. There are some matters that cannot be arbitrated. That is, no Arbitrator when he is asked to decide on certain issues it is impossible for him to make a decision that is workable. Such decisions or such issues can better be settled or can only be settled by negotiation.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

To give an example of what I mean, it is impossible for an Arbitrator to arbitrate recognition of a Union. You get it or you don't. No recognition; therefore, no Union. It is impossible for an Arbitrator to arbitrate many things, especially if those things go to the very foundation of the Union without which the Union can't live. And it has generally been our proposition that certain matters of that type we have refused to arbitrate them, because we knew that arbitration [5521] would be fruitless. We have always taken other positions on arbitration: That we would not re-arbitrate matters that had already been arbitrated. In other words, arbitration is not for the purpose of keeping on arbitrating a particular question after an issue has once been decided for the simple reason that one side is pushing for arbitration knowing that they have got nothing to lose and they might gain something.

So under those circumstances, such as I have described, at times we have refused arbitration. But on any general question that doesn't go to the very life of the Union we have always favored both mediation and arbitration and used it. In most cases we have used it entirely on those matters, providing that recognition of the Union, the protection against discrimination for union activities or union membership and such things as that is already secured or guaranteed through negotiation.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

By Mr. Grossman:

Q. Can you give some specific examples in the experience of the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union of your position on arbitration?

Mr. Del Guercio: Now, if your Honor please, I will object to that. We are going from the general to the specific.

Presiding Inspector: He has given his fundamental view. Shouldn't you leave that for cross examination?

Mr. Grossman: Well, I could leave it if I am guaranteed [5522] that they go into it, but if they are not going to I prefer to do it on direct, your Honor, because I think the specific example is much more clear-cut. Where there may not be conviction from a general statement there would certainly be, I think, from a specific example which was only explicable in the light of the theory which we claim Mr. Bridges has. In other words, I think the general is never as convincing as the specific example, for obvious reasons. I don't think this will be very lengthy.

Presiding Inspector: Very well. You may answer.

A. That would be difficult. We have engaged in some 200-odd arbitrations in the last six or seven years, both the ILA and the ILWU. To pick out any specific case, why, it is simple. But generally arbitration comes either in two or three

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

ways: To prevent a dispute by both parties agreeing that they will submit the issues in dispute to arbitration; to settle part of a dispute where agreement has been reached on certain things and the rest are referred to arbitration; to end a dispute after a dispute is already under way by referring the matters to arbitration for settlement, and to clarify certain issues after an agreement has been reached and the agreement provides that there will be no stoppage of work and all disputes be settled by arbitration. So we have used all methods and generally do. It is not very well known, of course. There are very many conflicting opinions on arbitration [5523] and the word is loosely thrown around sometimes. But as a rule we have used it in most of our minor and major disputes in some form or other. [5524]

By Mr. Grossman:

Q. Can you state generally approximately how many cases are submitted to arbitration each year by the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union for longshoremen, rather, under the longshore agreements?

Mr. Del Guercio: I object to that.

Presiding Inspector: I don't think it is material if they make an agreement. I suppose there is a general arbitration agreement, isn't there?

Mr. Grossman: I think the experience, nevertheless, of collective bargaining agreements, there often—that is, since they are rather loose and have

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

no real compulsion, as Dean Wayne Morse testified, sometimes you have an arbitration provision in an agreement, which is not carried out in good faith by one or the other parties—in other words, to sabotage the use of the arbitration procedure, and actually refuse it in some cases. You will find many agreements which perhaps have an arbitration clause, and because of sabotage or refusal by one side or the other, it isn't used.

Presiding Inspector: You already have the proof, testimony of Dean Morse on that.

Mr. Grossman: Correct. I will withdraw it for that reason.

By Mr. Grossman:

Q. Do you remember, Mr. Bridges, a particular negotia- [5525] tion between the Newspaper Guild and the publishers into which you entered briefly where the issue was one of whether a strike would take place for the Guild shop, or closed shop, or preferential hiring? A. I do.

Q. Will you state briefly the circumstances surrounding your being brought into that picture?

Mr. Del Guercio: I will object to that, if your Honor please, as not being in issue here.

Presiding Inspector: Isn't this pretty remote?

Mr. Grossman: This is a specific example of Mr. Bridges adopting a policy—

Presiding Inspector: Taking part in that arbitration.

Mr. Grossman: No. This is a specific example of



(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

his participating in a policy which is completely inconsistent with the descriptions given by those government witnesses I quoted before, and to state generally what its significance is, will be, I will say this: This example, when given, will show that Mr. Bridges was called in, in an advisory capacity by the union involved, this newspaper Guild, and he went to the extent of opposing a good many of their Negotiating Committee who decided to strike on this sole issue, and suggested to them the possibility of achieving it without a strike, and indicated a definite desire to use all methods short of a strike, even at the expense of disagreement with the Negotiating Committee [5526] involved.

Presiding Inspector: Wasn't this case sketched generally by Mr. Kagel?

Mr. Grossman: No. We weren't permitted to go into examples. I started to go into this and you cut me short. So we have given no specific examples through the other witnesses.

Presiding Inspector: All right. This will be short?

Mr. Grossman: Yes.

By Mr. Grossman:

Q. Will you state, generally and briefly, what brought you into the picture?

A. Negotiations were under way at that time for a contract between the union and the newspaper publishers for the City of San Francisco and Oakland. The Union, in some degree, and the Committee negotiating the contract believed that the only way to get



(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

the desired provisions in the contract was by a strike. In effect, they had relinquished that demand and there was a demand for a union ship in the previous year's negotiations.

The only part that I played was in the capacity as a CIO official I met with the Committee, and after reviewing the circumstances and the possibilities of the strike on that issue alone, I advised against it.

An agreement was signed and negotiated, negotiated and [5527] signed, without any strike taking place.

Q. What was the attitude of the Committee before you began to participate in it, or at the time you began to participate with them?

Mr. Del Guercio: I think the Committee would be the best—

Presiding Inspector: Having allowed it so far, I will allow the rest.

By Mr. Grossman:

Q. What was the Committee's attitude at the time you entered into the picture with respect to whether a strike should be carried on solely on this issue of the union shop?

A. It favored a strike; mistakenly so, I thought.

Q. As a result of your participation—withdraw that. After you expressed your views on that matter was a decision finally made by this Negotiating Committee that they would not strike for a union shop?

A. That is correct. Although I would not say solely as a result of my being there and so advising:

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Q. I didn't ask that. After you participated they made that decision, did they? A. Yes.

Q. Did you state what methods they could use to obtain that union shop, if any?

Mr. Del Guercio: I object to any further inquiry along [5528] this line.

Presiding Inspector: How did they achieve it?

Mr. Grossman: His suggestion to them, if any, as to how, in lieu of a strike, they should take action to obtain a union shop.

Presiding Inspector: You are forcing this pretty far. I will take it.

A. We discussed it. I really can't say the program we outlined now; I can't remember it.

By Mr. Grossman:

Q. Do you remember a threatened strike of the Marine Cooks and Stewards in 1940?

Presiding Inspector: I think you have gone far on this. This is the third strike. Is this a strike of his union?

Mr. Grossman: A union.

Presiding Inspector: His union?

Mr. Grossman: No. A strike in which he played a very important part, and it is very significant evidence along this line.

Presiding Inspector: I think it is immaterial. We have one example.

Mr. Grossman: This is a different example.

Presiding Inspector: I know. Are we going to have fifty examples?

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Mr. Grossman: If they are of different things.

[5529]

Let me state what this is, and I will state it briefly because it will save time.

Presiding Inspector: You need not do that. If you think this is important you may have it.

Mr. Grossman: I will cut down on the examples, but this is slightly a different example.

Presiding Inspector: I think these are all immaterial.

Mr. Grossman: I think it is important.

Mr. Del Guercio: We object to it on that ground.

By Mr. Grossman:

Q. Do you remember a threatened strike involving the Marine Cooks and Stewards in 1940?

A. Yes.

Q. What was the issue of that threatened strike?

Mr. Del Guercio: We object to that, if your Honor please. We cannot try the issues of these strikes.

Presiding Inspector: No.

Mr. Grossman: There is no dispute about the issues.

Mr. Del Guercio: There is a dispute about everything that was said going in.

Mr. Grossman: I think you will agree in this case with what Mr. Hillman said.

Presiding Inspector: You shouldn't have things like that on the record.

Mr. Grossman: Mr. Del Guercio isn't going to

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

take the [5530] position that his position was Communistic, I am sure of that.

Presiding Inspector: Go ahead.

A. The issues, I think, were a six-hour day for the men on board ships in the culinary department; a certain number of men, called the Manning Scale, a certain number of men required on ships of certain tonnage; and proper protection of seniority rights.

By Mr. Grossman:

Q. Had the union taken a strike vote when you came into the picture? A. They had.

Q. And how close to the strike deadline was it at the time you came into the picture?

Mr. Del Guercio: I object to that, your Honor.

Presiding Inspector: I will take it.

A. Two hours.

By Mr. Grossman:

Q. How did you happen to come into the picture?

A. I was appointed to act on behalf of the Advisory Commission on National Defense.

Q. Who appointed you?

A. Mr. Sidney Hillman.

Q. How did he appoint you?

A. He just appointed me. You mean by—

Q. (Interposing): How were you notified?

[5531]

A. He telephoned me and wired me.

Q. What did he tell you to do, if anything?

Mr. Del Guercio: I will object to any conversation had with Mr. Hillman by this witness.

Mr. Grossman: I want to know what position he

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

was supposed to play, what Mr. Hillman asked him to do.

Presiding Inspector: I will take that, but not as any definite instructions as to an attitude which he should take.

Mr. Grossman: Yes.

Presiding Inspector: Unless the Government wants that.

A: I had no instructions. He told me he had notified both parties and, if agreeable to me, he would ask me to act on behalf of the Commission in this case to see if we could arrange a settlement prior to the strike deadline.

By Mr. Grossman:

Q. Did you then begin to participate in the negotiations between the union and the employer?

A. I met with both groups and worked out a compromise.

Q. Was an agreement reached without a strike?

A. At a quarter of a minute to midnight, which was the strike deadline, we reached an agreement.

Presiding Inspector: When was that?

The Witness: The end of 1940, I think, or—in the fall of 1940.

Mr. Grossman: One moment, your Honor. [5532]

Your Honor, Mr. Gladstein is going to take over the examination now.

Mr. Del Guercio: Well, if your Honor please, we object to changing counsel in the middle of the examination.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Presiding Inspector: I will allow it. Go ahead. We have been very liberal about this. In fact, there isn't any rule here, you know.

Mr. Gladstein: I don't think there is a—

Presiding Inspector: Go ahead.

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. Mr. Bridges, do you remember the witness, William C. McCuiston? A. Yes.

Q. He testified in substance that he first met you in the early part of 1935, somewhere around April or May, just prior to a convention of the Maritime Federation of the Pacific. And in his testimony he mentioned meeting you on the street and being introduced to you near the water front by a man named Frederick Reeds. Did any such occurrence ever happen? A. No.

Q. He testified that that same evening, or in the evening, by prearrangement with you, he met you at the Communist headquarters. Did anything like that ever happen? A. No. [5533]

Q. Did you ever discuss with him the question of his expulsion from the Communist Party?

A. No.

Q. Did you ever ask him at or about that period, or at any time, to stay on the Pacific Coast and assist you in forming a bloc against Harry Lundeborg?

A. No.

Q. Now, at that time, the time that Mr. McCuiston is referring to, the early part of 1935, prior to the Maritime Federation Convention of that year,



(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

what, in general, was your relationship to Harry Lundeberg?      A. Friendly and——

Mr. Del Guercio (Interposing): I object to that, unless it is intended to bring Harry Lundeberg in here.

Mr. Gladstein: It is intended to show Mr. McCuistion was a liar. /

Mr. Del Guercio: Mr. McCuistion was not a liar.

Presiding Inspector: Well, I don't suppose the statement of either——

Mr. Del Guercio: (Interposing): And they can't show he is a liar.

Presiding Inspector: Well——

Mr. Del Guercio (Interposing): They know it.

Presiding Inspector: Let me hear the question.

Mr. Gladstein: Read the question. [5534]

(The question referred to was read by the reporter as above recorded.)

Presiding Inspector: Do you mean the character of it, or what business he had with him?

Mr. Gladstein: The general character of the relationship.

Presiding Inspector: I will take it.

A. We were working very closely together——

Presiding Inspector: No. He wants to know whether or not you were friends or otherwise.

A. (Continuing): Very friendly. We were in full support of him.

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. And at the convention which followed, this

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

period of time, the convention which took place in 1935,—what month was it, by the way?

A. April 15, 1935.

Q. At that convention, Mr. Bridges, what was your open position as to support or non-support of Harry Lundeberg for an office or an official position in the Maritime Federation?

A. Full support. We nominated him, placed him on our votes, gave him our vote, and elected him.

Q. Now, Mr. McCuistion testified that he left the Pacific Coast around June of 1935. Was your position, up to [5535] and through June of 1935, was your relationship with Harry Lundeberg the same as you have just described? A. It was.

Q. When, for the first time, did your relationship with Lundeberg take a different direction?

A. Not until 1936.

Q. Did you ever receive any communications from Lundeberg in 1935? A. I did.

(Whereupon Mr. Gladstein passed a communication to Mr. Del Guercio.)

Mr. Gladstein: Is there a possibility of seeing the date in June, 1935, when Mr. McCuistion said, and the record shows, that he departed from San Francisco?

Presiding Inspector: Ask Mr. Gaiser.

Mr. Gladstein: There is a photostatic copy of some—

The Witness (Interposing): June 6th.

Mr. Gladstein: Do you recall it as June 6th?

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. Now, Mr. McCuistion testified that in these conversations prior to his sailing from San Francisco in the early part of June, 1935, you, in a conversation, asked McCuistion to stay on the West Coast and help you form a bloc to fight Lundeberg. Did any such conversation ever occur?

A. No. [5536]

Q. I show you a letter, which I have already shown to counsel, under date of June 22, 1935, a date subsequent to the time that McCuistion left the Pacific Coast, and purporting to be signed by Harry Lundeberg, and I will ask you whether you received that and recognize that as a letter from Harry Lundeberg?

A. (Examining letter) I do.

Mr. Gladstein: I offer that in evidence, your Honor, because it shows a relationship between Bridges and Lundeberg which was one of friendship and closely——

Mr. Del Guercio: (Interposing) Is that an argument in support of the offer?

Mr. Gladstein: I am addressing myself to the Court.

Mr. Del Guercio: I haven't made my objection.

Presiding Inspector: Let us hear the objection.

Mr. Gladstein: May I finish my statement in support of my offer?

Presiding Inspector: No.

Mr. Del Guercio: It contains extraneous matters,

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

nothing that would contradict anything that was introduced in this hearing.

Mr. Gladstein: In answer to that it is my contention, your Honor, that that letter, and the testimony of Mr. Bridges, directly contradicts and throws the lie in the face of the witness, McCuiston. [5537]

Mr. Del Guercio: I question that, if your Honor please, and I question the authenticity of the letter. I suggest that Mr. Lundeborg be called.

Mr. Gladstein: You can call him.

Mr. Del Guercio: You won't dare.

Mr. Gladstein: I said you can call him.

Mr. Del Guercio: And immaterial also.

Mr. Gladstein: You can call him.

(The letter offered was passed to the Presiding Inspector.)

Presiding Inspector: I don't see how this proves the attitude of Mr. Bridges.

Mr. Gladstein: The attitude of Mr. Bridges and the attitude of Mr. Lundeborg are integral parts of each other as of that time and—

Presiding Inspector: It may or may not be.

Mr. Gladstein: I don't quite understand.

Presiding Inspector: I mean to say that may show what Mr. Lundeborg thought of the friendship of Mr. Bridges, but that might not necessarily be so.

Mr. Gladstein: But if you will read this letter—

Presiding Inspector: I read it.

Mr. Gladstein (Continuing): —you will see—

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Presiding Insepctor: I saw a lot of extraneous matter in the letter. [5538]

Mr. Gladstein: I renew my offer, and I wish the record to show that the reason for this offer, though it comes from Mr. Lundeberg to Mr. Bridges, and reflects a friendly attitude on the part of Lundeberg toward Bridges, it also refers in its contents to a previous request made by Bridges of Mr. Lundeberg and——

Presiding Inspector: We can't take that as original evidence of anything of that kind, as to whether there is some other matter concerned. This witness can testify about that.

Mr. Gladstein: He has testified, but I have documentary evidence to support his testimony. Is it your position that we are not permitted to put in the documentary evidence that will support that testimony?

Mr. Myron: Mr. Lundeberg is available.

Presiding Inspector: Produce your documentary evidence.

Mr. Gladstein: I consider this proper and I offer it in evidence.

Presiding Inspector: Let's have the other documentary evidence first.

Mr. Gladstein: What other documentary evidence.

Presiding Inspector: That this supports, you say.

Mr. Gladstein: Every letter Mr. Bridges has written is not in his possession.

Presiding Inspector: I thought you said you had it. [5539]

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Mr. Gladstein: I said this letter refers to a previous request, as you will see there, a request made by Mr. Bridges.

Presiding Inspector: I didn't notice it. The tone of the letter, I thought that was what you were offering it for.

Mr. Gladstein: Also for the tone.

(The letter referred to was passed back to the Presiding Inspector.)

Presiding Inspector: I can't read this (indicating).

Mr. Gladstein: What part, your Honor?

(Whereupon the Presiding Inspector and Mr. Gladstein conferred over the document.)

Presiding Inspector: I will receive it.

Mr. Del Guercio: If your Honor please, we question—

Presiding Inspector: I will receive it.

Mr. Del Guercio (Continuing): We question the authenticity of that document.

Presiding Inspector: I will receive it. He said he received it in the mail.

(The letter referred to was received in evidence and marked Alien's Exhibit No. 31.)

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. When was the first time you ever in your life met William C. McCaustion?

A. December 1936 at the Madison Square Garden.



(Testimony of Harry Repton Bridges.)

Q. Did you meet him at all prior to the actual Garden [5540] meeting?

A. I believe I did at that time in New York. I mean that that was the first time I met him when I was in New York to attend that meeting.

Q. What was the extent of the relationship, or of any conversations that you had with Mr. McCuiston on that occasion?

A. Very brief; so brief I can't even recall it.

Q. Can you state whether you ever discussed with him the question of his membership in or expulsion from the Communist Party?

A. I never have.

Q. Have you ever seen him since the time of the Madison Square Garden meeting to the time that he came into court, to your knowledge?

A. No.

Q. Now, Mr. McCuiston testified, and Mr. Innes testified, that you had flatly refused to come to the east to address the Madison Square Garden meeting—

Presiding Inspector: Don't you think it would be better to ask the questions, without telling the witness first

Mr. Gladstein: I am directing his attention to something.

Presiding Inspector: I know. I think you are doing it in a questionable way; that is all.

Mr. Gladstein: I will withdraw the question if you think [5541] it is improper.

Presiding Inspector: You can suggest the subject matter, whether John Jones or Richard Roe tes-

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

tified to something, but not to suggest to the witness to enable him to testify. You have got a very competent witness here.

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. I will refer you, Mr. Bridges, to the Madison Square Garden meeting in December 1936. What was the situation on the Pacific Coast as of that time with respect to the strike?

A. We had the strike won on the West Coast.

Q. When did that strike begin?

A. October 28, 1936.

Q. What unions were involved in this strike?

A. The unions that were actually participating in the strike were all the unions affiliated with the Maritime Federation, some twelve or fourteen all told, or more; and, of course, practically directly involved in the strike to some extent was the Teamsters' Union.

Q. What was the situation on the East Coast with respect to the strike on the West Coast?

A. The East Coast was on a sympathetic strike, the East Coast Seamen, and as the strike appeared to be nearing a point where a settlement could be reached it was necessary to determine what was going to happen, and what was going to be the program in so far as the East Coast Seamen were concerned.

[5542]

Q. Now, had you had any discussions with any representatives of the East Coast Seamen prior to the time that the Madison Square Garden meeting was held?

A. Yes.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Q. With whom, and what kind of discussions?

A. Well, with both Innes, Peter Innes and Joe Curran. Curran was out here prior to the strike taking place, although we didn't discuss the strike then, we discussed the general strategy in connection with securing an agreement, the possibility of a strike. We were endeavoring to postpone the strike then, and we did. Then later on, between the West and the East Coast, by telephone, telegram, letter and teletype.

Q. You just mentioned that you were endeavoring to postpone the strike. Had there been a prior strike deadline?

A. Yes. The strike—the strike—when our agreement terminated September 30 of that year, and the employers had notified us that unless there was a new agreement that they would close down on September 30th, so we were engaged in attempting to postpone the closing down date. They were all prepared, there were political implications, and one thing and another, and eventually we succeeded in having the shutdown date postponed for two or three periods of 15 days, or one period of 30 days, and one period of 15 or 18 days.

Q. Were any of these postponements requested by any [5543] representatives of the United States Government?

A. Yes.

Q. By whom?

A. Well, Daniel Tobin, and at that time he was the Labor Chairman for the Democratic Party; John

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

L. Lewis was very much concerned, and Edward F. McGrady.

Q. Who was he?

A. The Assistant Secretary of Labor.

Mr. Myron: Is that responsive, these officials of the United States Government?

Presiding Inspector: I don't suppose so.

Mr. Myron: I don't think that is what the question called for.

Mr. Gladstein: I consider it responsive. If you can't understand it——

Presiding Officer: I don't think it is responsive, but——

The Witness (Interposing): The request was transmitted to me through John L. Lewis saying the President had requested we postpone our strike.

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. What was done after you received that?

Presiding Inspector: It isn't harmful that I can see.

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. What was done, Mr. Bridges?

A. We done everything we could to postpone the strike. [5544]

Q. That was an election year, was it not?

A. That is right. We were urged to see that no strike broke out until after the election date. We held it down until October 28th.

Q. That is when the strike began?

A. October 28th. The elections, I think, were on November 2.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Q. Now, at about that time did I understand you to say that you had discussions with Mr. Curran?

A. Prior to that time.

Q. And what, in general, was the nature of the discussions with reference to what should be done on the East Coast in the event a strike occurred on the West Coast?

A. To support us and to use every effort they could to have the longshoremen also support us; that is, the East Coast longshoremen also support us.

[5545]

Q. Now, after the strike broke out on the West Coast was any policy adopted on the West Coast with respect to the sending of delegations of speakers from the West Coast to the East Coast to address strikers there?

A. Yes.

Presiding Inspector: In respect to that Dietrich letter, don't you think that you ought to show that this witness knew his handwriting?

Mr. Gladstein: You mean the Lundeborg letter?

Presiding Inspector: The Lundeborg letter.

Mr. Gladstein: Yes. I will ask him that question.

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. Are you able to recognize the handwriting of Mr. Lundeborg?

A. I am. I received that letter when I was in the hospital at that time and I received quite a few communications from him, including, I think, three bouquets of flowers. I am well acquainted with the handwriting.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Presiding Inspector: Is that in his handwriting?

The Witness: It is.

Mr. Del Guercio: Well, I don't believe that it has been established yet that he knows the handwriting of Harry Lundeberg.

Presiding Inspector: He has had communications from him. [5546]

Mr. Del Guercio: Well, three of them. Were they all the same?

Presiding Inspector: You may examine when the time comes.

The Witness. I have had numerous communications from him.

Mr. Del Guercio: I will object on this ground: That Lundeberg is available here.

Presiding Inspector: That doesn't make any difference. If the witness knows of his handwriting you can introduce the document. We are not so strict about that, having seen him write, as we used to be. I mean, even in Courts of Justice.

Mr. Del Guercio: Any particular part of this letter here you have reference to?

Mr. Gladstein: Well, yes.

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. By whom was such a policy adopted, Mr. Bridges?

A. First by the Longshoremen's Coast Executive Committee, then submitted and recommended to the Joint Coast Policy Committee and adopted there.

Q. Was any official publication of such a policy or program ever made?



(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

A. You mean in the——

Q. (Interposing): Was any release of this program ever made?

A. Yes. All locals were notified. [5547]

Q. Locals of what?

A. Of the District Union of the ILA at that time, and the East Coast was also notified. We sent copies to the various East Coast groups we were working with; that is, the Seamen's groups in the East Coast, the Seamen's Defense Committee and others.

Q. That would include, that is, the groups to which copies of this announcement of the official policy of the West Coast in connection with the activities of the East Coast and the sending of delegations from the West to the East, were sent to various groups including the group of which Mr. Curran is a leader? A. That is correct.

Mr. Del Guercio: If your Honor please, the questions are so long that counsel propounded that I can't follow them and I doubt very much if they are questions here.

Presiding Inspector: Perhaps you had better have the reporter read them if you don't understand them. Sometimes I don't.

Mr. Gladstein: Did you understand the question?

Mr. Del Guercio: Will you read the question?

(The question referred to was read by the reporter as above recorded.)

Mr. Del Guercio: Your Honor, I will object to that as not being a question. It's an answer. [5548]

Presiding Inspector: Well, he said it was correct,

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

so that I don't believe we need go over it again. I will let it stand.

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. Now, Mr. Bridges, I show you what purports to be on the official letterhead of the International Longshoremen's Association, affiliated then with the American Federation of Labor, under date of November 19, 1936 a mimeographed letter consisting of three and a half pages and purporting to be signed by yourself. Will you identify it, please?

A. This is a letter sent out by the Longshoremen's Negotiating Committee or Strike Committee at that time outlining to all locals our entire and detailed method of proceeding to prosecute the strike, our entire strike policy.

Q. Does this policy as expressed in this letter include the program outlined on and by the West Coast for the activities on the East Coast?

A. Yes.

Q. With specific reference to the question of West Coast delegations being sent back to address meetings of the East Coast, will you please point to the portion.

A. That's the last point in the program, the last page.

Mr. Gladstein: I call your Honor's attention to the top of page four of this document.

(The document referred to was passed to the Presiding [5549] Inspector.)

Presiding Inspector: Just this?

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Mr. Gladstein: I am going to offer the entire letter in evidence as showing the policy outlined in connection with the conduct of the strike, showing the chronological series of steps which were recommended and adopted to be taken, one of which is the question of sending delegations to the East Coast.

I offer this letter in evidence, your Honor.

Mr. Del Guercio: Well, if your Honor please, before we make any objection I want to know whether that reference made by counsel is the only one upon which he is introducing this letter in support of his contention that that was the policy of the West Coast at that time, to send people to the East Coast.

Mr. Gladstein: I don't quite understand the question. Do you mean, Mr. Del Guercio, you want to know if I have further proof to offer on the subject?

Mr. Del Guercio: No. If there is anything further in that letter other than that one paragraph that you showed me in support of your statement that the policy was to send speakers to the East Coast.

Mr. Gladstein: Well, I think this is the point. The letter sets forth a rather comprehensive program for the prosecution of the strike and the integration of the efforts being made on the two coasts. One of those recommendations [5550] which is adopted and made a part of the program, is an idea of sending delegations at suitable times back to Eastern and Gulf ports. That is only one of them. I think to tear that out of its context and leaving it

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

standing alone, without showing what the balance is to which it refers; would perhaps distort that part of it. Therefore, I think the entire program as set forth in this letter should be admitted in evidence. I doubt whether counsel will claim that this letter incorrectly states what the program was by the Union.

Mr. Del Guercio: My point is that there is nothing in the letter that you pointed me out that states that it was the policy to send delegates to speak on the East Coast. All there is there, the portion that you referred to me, was "Delegations were to be sent to Eastern and Gulf Coasts to prevail on long-shoremen for economic action".

Mr. Gladstein: I will have the witness explain what that means, if there is any uncertainty in the mind of the Court.

Presiding Inspector: I think I will take the letter.

(The letter referred to was received in evidence and marked Alien's Exhibit No. 32.)

Mr. Del Guercio: I think counsel should refrain from making a remark of that kind. He has the witness on the stand and to put the words in his mouth on matters of that kind is unfair, I think.

Mr. Gladstein: What did I say that was unfair?

[5551]

Do you know, your Honor

Mr. Del Guercio: Have the witness explain.

Presiding Inspector: I think he complains of your having said that you would have the witness cover this.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Mr. Gladstein: If there is any uncertainty in your mind:

Presiding Inspector: Go ahead. I can hardly rule on that.

Mr. Del Guercio: Sir?

Presiding Inspector: That calls for some conduct of this case by Mr. Gladstein; I can hardly rule on that.

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. Part of this program which was adopted and officially announced on November 19, 1936 was, as follows:

"That suitable time be allowed for publicity campaign and if same is not successful in bringing required Governmental pressure on Employers, in order they negotiate and agree to Union demands, that the West Coast ILA send delegations to Eastern and Gulf Coasts to prevail on longshoremen there for economic action". I was quoting from page four of Alien's Exhibit 32 in evidence. Now, will you explain——

Mr. Myron: (Interposing): Do I understand that this document has been introduced in evidence?

Presiding Inspector: Yes.

Mr. Myron: This document has been introduced in evidence?

Presiding Inspector: Yes. I said I would receive it. [5552]

Mr. Myron: I don't see any necessity in quoting from it.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Presiding Inspector: Well, we have done that all the way through, both sides. There isn't any need. But that has been the practice in this hearing from the very start. We have had great numbers of Communist documents introduced and read from, and it perhaps will enable the Presiding Inspector to analyze this case in his own mind without reading every one of the documents from beginning to end.

Mr. Myron: I understand it was part of a question that was being asked. That is my objection.

Mr. Gladstein: I never finished because Mr. Myron interposed his objection. I was about to ask a question, yes. I didn't get to that before we heard from Mr. Myron.

Presiding Inspector: Well, go ahead.

Mr. Myron: That was my objection, your Honor, as I understood.

Presiding Inspector: I didn't understand that. I thought the objection was reading.

Mr. Del Guercio: Because of the preliminaries, the preliminary is so long that we don't know where the question begins and ends.

Presiding Inspector: I know we have that all the time in this hearing. It seems to be the practice adopted by both sides.

Go ahead. I think it is not very good practice.

[5553]

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. Now, Mr. Bridges, with reference to the part of the program set forth in the last exhibit, Alien's Exhibit 32, as to sending speakers to the East to



(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

prevail on longshoremen to cooperate, will you explain what that had reference to, what the situation was that that referred to?

Mr. Del Guercio: Now, if your Honor please, I object to that. The document, of course, speaks for itself.

Presiding Inspector: Yes. I think the document does.

Mr. Gladstein: I am not asking for an interpretation of the document, but the situation to which the document refers.

Mr. Del Guercio: Counsel has asked the witness, quoting one paragraph from that document—

Presiding Inspector: (Interposing): That is all we are interested in, I suppose, except for its setting.

Mr. Gladstein: We can have the witness explain the whole situation on both Coasts within his knowledge, if that is the objection.

Presiding Inspector: I don't think that is necessary.

Mr. Gladstein: I don't quite get the point of the objection.

Presiding Inspector: I will let the witness answer what the general condition was in respect to which these de- [5554] legates were to be sent.

Mr. Gladstein: That is right, your Honor.

Presiding Inspector: I think the word is "delegates" rather than "speakers".

Mr. Gladstein: "Delegates" yes.

Mr. Del Guercio: "Delegations".

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridgés.)

Presiding Inspector: "Delegations" rather than "speakers."

A. To answer the question you would have to briefly outline the entire strategy, the type of strike and all the rest of it.

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. Well, I am asking you to do that.

Mr. Del Guercio: I will object to that, if your Honor please. In other words, the witness admits that he can't answer the question without going into a number of other matters that have not been asked.

Mr. Gladstein: Now, if your Honor please,—

Presiding Inspector: (Interposing): If counsel wants it I will allow him to have it. Go ahead.

A. Because of the nature of the strike, the strike was a coastwise strike, no attempt was made to operate the ships or use strike breakers. It was the type of a strike that was going to be a kind of sit-out campaign. As a matter of fact, just shortly before we drew up this program it was announced by the ship owning employers that they would keep the ships [5555] tied up for two years to beat us. So it was a kind of a deadlock, no activity or anything, and there was two schools of thought in how to prosecute the strike. One was by militant action to spread the strike, to involve other industries as against the policy that is outlined in that program there, a program of wide publicity to bring the issues of the strike forward, to build up the morale of the men and keep them solid because there was very

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

little activity going on. Picket lines were not of any great use and we well knew that the strike would be won or lost in Washington because of which way the Government might move in the case.

Mr. Del Guercio: Well now, if the Court please, so far I haven't heard a word about this whole piece of sending speakers to the East Coast.

Presiding Inspector: Well, there wasn't any question about that. It was the question of the general conditions—

Mr. Del Guescio: (Interposing): "Policy".

Presiding Inspector: No. The general conditions then prevailing.

Mr. Del Guercio: That is the witness' explanation. He said he couldn't answer the question unless he went into that. The question, as I understand it, is still directed to the policy of sending speakers out to the East Coast.

Presiding Inspector: Read the question, Mr. Reporter.

Mr. Gladstein: Of course, your Honor, we will never get [5556] anywhere if at the end of every sentence Mr. Myron or Mr. Del Guercio pops up to say "I haven't heard the answer" or "Is this responsive?" or, when I am asking a question, when I stop for breath—

Mr. Myron: (Interposing): We won't get very far if we have statements before each question as we have been having.

Presiding Inspector: I think we are losing time, Mr. Gladstein.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Read the question, Mr. Reporter.

(The question referred to was read by the reporter as follows:

"Q. Now, Mr. Bridges, with reference to the part of the program set forth in the last exhibit, Alien's Exhibit 32, as to sending speakers to the East to prevail on longshoremen to cooperate, will you explain what that had reference to, what the situation was ~~that~~ that referred to?"

Presiding Inspector: "Situation was that that referred to", that is the part that I heard particularly.

The Witness: That's right. And it was a part of the strike strategy. As I say, the strike differed. It wasn't the type of strike that was fought by—

Presiding Inspector: (Interposing) Yes, you have told us about that.

The Witness: And we had to build the whole thing up [5557] to a certain point before it was wise or of any great use to send delegations back to the East Coast. The meetings and the parades and the rallies were all arranged on the Pacific Coast and they took place, and then a delegation was sent back immediately following the big mass meeting in San Francisco here, which was December the 8th and it was a delegation. Randolph Meriweather of the Marine Engineers, a man named Captain Charlotte of the Masters, Mates & Pilots, and myself was the delegation that was on the East Coast at that time. They were taking care of licensed officers' groups. I was taking care of the longshoremen and the seamen.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. What was the problem——

A. (Interposing): And that was the ultimate outcome. That was putting into effect the last point on that twelve-point program to win the strike and build it up to a point where we could settle it.

Q. What was the problem with the longshoremen and seamen on the East Coast which it was felt required sending delegates from the West Coast?

A. They were working. We had been promised support by the international officers in the International Union of the ILA who would support us on the West Coast, even to the extent of striking. The International reneged on that support, and then when the seamen supported us, had their strike declared an outlaw strike—— [5558]

Q. (Interposing): Who had their strike declared an outlaw strike?

A. That is the International Seamen's Union, although their strike was called in keeping with the constitution it was declared illegal and found so by the American Federation of Labor convention that at that time—around that time—met in Florida. So as a result of these things, all these things coupled together, we thought it was necessary to send a delegation to the East Coast to not only try to secure support but, incidentally, to survey the situation to bring back a factual report to the West Coast so we would know exactly how to move and how and when to end the strike, if a favorable opportunity appeared.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Q. Were the longshoremen on the East Coast working ships in such a way as to endanger the West Coast strike? A. Yes.

Mr. Del Guercio: Well, if your Honor please, I will object to that extraneous matter, and leading and suggestive not to say the least, and immaterial and irrelevant.

Mr. Gladstein: I can state the materiality. The purpose of the question is to show, your Honor, that the situation was such that it was anticipated on November 19th, it was believed because of what had happened between October 28th and November 19th that it might be necessary to send a delegation or delegations from the West Coast to seek the sup-

[5559]  
port of the longshoremen on the East Coast, as this letter says, because of the factual situation, which I now want to bring out, namely,—

Presiding Inspector: (Interposing): What is the date of that letter?

Mr. Gladstein: November 19, 1936, your Honor. And, as you see, it specifically refers to West Coast ILA sending delegations to Eastern and Gulf Coasts to prevail on longshoremen for economic action. I was going to show that the situation was such on the East Coast at the time this letter was drawn up and sent that the possibility of successful outcome of the West Coast strike was endangered and depended in a major part on the role that the East Coast longshoremen would play.



(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Presiding Inspector: This all bears on the probability of the truthfulness of the testimony of—

Mr. Gladstein: (Interposing): McCuistion and Innes.

Presiding Inspector: (Continuing): Curran, McCuistion and Innes?

Mr. Gladstein: That's right, your Honor.

Presiding Inspector: Pretty remote.

Mr. Gladstein: Well, now, as I recall it, your Honor, McCuistion and Innes in effect said that Bridges refused to go East.

Presiding Inspector: Yes, at this time. [5560]

Mr. Gladstein: What?

Presiding Inspector: At that time when they talked with him.

Mr. Gladstein: Yes. Well, that was in the first part of December.

Presiding Inspector: Well, sending delegations doesn't necessarily include Mr. Bridges.

Mr. Gladstein: This is only the first step in a chain of proof that we intend to introduce, your Honor. This is only one letter, one document among the number that we intend to offer.

Presiding Inspector: The document is in,

Mr. Gladstein: I know.

Presiding Inspector: And you have got the attitude, the description of the condition in. Now, what more do you want?

Mr. Gladstein: I want to show that the situation on the East Coast was such that Mr. Bridges from November 19th on could have had no other attitude

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

as a sincere trade unionist but that he would go back as soon as it was possible for him to do so, to go back and address those men and attempt to get their co-operation, and that it would be inconceivable for a man of Bridges' type to give a flat denial.

Presiding Inspector: I think you had better leave this for the final argument of the case, because this is not an argument on the admissibility of this evidence but on its [5561] effect.

Mr. Gladstein: No.

Presiding Inspector: Or at least I so take it. I may be wrong about it.

Mr. Gladstein: I am now asking you to allow evidence as to what the situation was on the East Coast as referred to in this letter.

Presiding Inspector: I have already allowed it and I thought he had given it.

Mr. Gladstein: No, there is a question pending on that very thing, your Honor.

Presiding Inspector: I think he has given it and that is all there is to it.

Mr. Gladstein: No, there is an unanswered question on it.

Presiding Inspector: You have had all about this being declared an outlaw strike and the vote and all these things.

Mr. Gladstein: But, your Honor, I just asked another question, which was——

Presiding Inspector: (Interposing): It is just the same, isn't it?

Mr. Gladstein: No.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Presiding Inspector: Then we will let you ask it after lunch.

Mr. Gladstein: All right. [5562]

Presiding Inspector: Two o'clock.

(Whereupon, at 12:35 o'clock P.M. a recess was taken until 2:00 o'clock P.M. of the same day.) [5563]

---

After Recess—2:00 O'Clock P.M.

Presiding Inspector: You may proceed.

### HARRY RENTON BRIDGES

called as a witness in his own behalf, having been previously duly sworn, testified further as follows:

#### Direct Examination (Resumed)

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. Mr. Bridges, before I go back to the subject matter you were discussing at the noon recess, I wish to ask you a question for clarification of the record. You were asked this morning whether you had been a Vice President of the California State Federation of Labor. I believe you said you were in the year 1936? A. That is right.

Q. Do you recall just what your term of office was?

A. It was supposed to be for a year, but it terminated before the end of the year.

Q. In what year did it terminate?

A. 1937.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Q. And just briefly what was the circumstances that caused the termination?

A. That might have been—I think it was a little prior to the time we affiliated with the CIO. Our unions were suspended before we affiliated with the CIO and my office automati- [5564] cally ended when my union was suspended from the State Federation of Labor.

Q. Now, at the noon recess you were discussing the situation on the east coast in the fall of 1936 as it related to the west coast strike.

Mr. Del Guercio: I am going to object to the statement of counsel. It isn't occasionally, but it is continuously. Preparatory to every question he makes a statement. I think it is highly objectionable.

Presiding Inspector: But this is to continue from the morning.

Mr. Gladstein: That is right; to direct his attention to a particular subject.

Presiding Inspector: Don't make these statements. Go ahead.

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. I wish to ask you—

Presiding Inspector: They are not evidence, though. We haven't any jury here, even though the box is full. Go ahead.

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. I wish to ask you now, Mr. Bridges, what the situation was on the East Coast with respect to long-

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

shoremen which offered a problem, if any problem was offered, to the conduct and successful conduct of the West Coast Strike? [5565]

Mr. Del Guercio: I will object to the question and to its form, and also object on the ground that it is immaterial.

Presiding Inspector: I will allow it.

A. The policy of the strike, or the possibilities of the strike, had been discussed at a national conference of our international union of the longshoremen in New York City in September, 1936. At that time it was agreed that on a national basis the West Coast would be supported by the national union.

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. Which national union?

A. International Longshoremen's Association. When we actually got to the strike the support was not forthcoming. The International officers refused to give the support that they had promised that in part led us somewhat into the strike. Therefore, later on in the strike, about a month after it started, I think, we set a deadline at a certain date that we would give the national union to give us the support on the East Coast and the Gulf that was promised us.

Q. What kind of support was that?

A. Various kinds of support, financial support, but mainly economic support in the way of refusing to load ships that were running to the Pacific Coast

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

and prolonging our strike. And we set a deadline as to when the loading of those ships should cease by members of our own International Union on the East Coast and in Gulf ports, and if the deadline [5566] passed without action being taken the delegations were to go back east and try to have the men take action in defiance of the International officials because of the agreement that had been properly made in September.

In addition to that, of course, many locals on the East Coast had communicated both to the International and to us their willingness and their desire to refuse to handle this cargo or load these ships, and they said that if they were asked by West Coast delegations of longshoremen to cease work on these ships they would do so.

Q. Is that the situation to which reference is made in the letter of November 19th where it speaks of sending delegations to request cooperation from East Coast longshoremen?

A. Yes.

Q. What was the significance, if any, of East Coast longshoremen working or continuing to work ships bound for the West Coast with respect to the successful conduct of your strike on the West Coast?

Mr. Del Guercio: I will object to that as being immaterial and irrelevant.

Presiding Inspector: I will take it.

A. The American Pacific Coast was shut down. That is, the entire coast line in all the American



(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

ports between the Canadian border and Mexico, and they were keeping it shut down, and at the same time moving certain goods by having ships come [5567] from the East Coast and discharging in ports in Mexico and then running the goods up by rail and having ships come and discharge in British Columbia and running the goods south by rail. In other words, Mexican ports and the West Coast of Mexico, Ensenada, were servicing California; British Columbia ports were servicing the Northwest. And those ships were being loaded and coming to the West Coast in an attempt to break down our strength, and at the same time keep a certain amount of freight moving, and those ships were being loaded and worked by our own union men affiliated with our own union that was on strike on the West Coast; at least, I mean, the same men on the East Coast, members of the same national union, after we had been promised and had a written agreement by the national union that we could get the support and they wouldn't do that.

Mr. Del Guercio: If your Honor please, I move that the entire answer be stricken upon the ground that it has nothing to do with the issues of this case.

Presiding Inspector: I understand it is the general picture, although I think it is pretty remote. This all bears on the testimony of McQuistion and Innes, I suppose. That is the whole purpose of this, isn't it?

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Mr. Gladstein: Well, yes.

Presiding Inspector: That is all, if that is its sole purpose. Of course, we are not interested in this strike as [5568] strike.

Mr. Gladstein: No. We are interested only in the position taken by Mr. Bridges at various stages of the strike as those positions reflect an attitude inconsistent with the testimony of any Government witness given.

Presiding Inspector: If it is inconsistent.

Mr. Gladstein: We submit that that is the purpose.

Presiding Inspector: That is your contention.

Mr. Gladstein: That is the purpose of it.

Presiding Inspector: Yes.

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. Now, Mr. Bridges, at about this time in 1936 were you acquainted with Peter J. Innes?

A. Yes.

Q. When did you first meet him?

A. The latter part of September, 1936, I think; it might have been earlier. I met him before the strike took place. I am not sure if I met him before we had the conference in New York, our International conference, but I would say it could have been August or September '36.

Q. Under what circumstances, do you recall?

A. I recall at least one circumstance; that was where he had ordered some crews off of a ship in the Port of San Francisco in defiance and

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

against the orders of our Maritime Council that generally had jurisdiction over such matters, [5569] if it was going to be participated in by all Unions.

Q. Do you recall whether you had any difficulties with Mr. Innes during the 1936 strike in any way with respect to the conduct by Innes of strike groups or committees? A. We did.

Q. When did you have such difficulty and what was its nature?

A. On matters of strike policy, the first part of the strike, we had a question as to how the strike should be conducted in respect to certain ships. For example, as to whether ships, whose home port was an eastern port, or a Gulf port, as to whether those ships would proceed back to their home ports before they were struck, or as to whether they would be struck in the ports where they happened to be at that time, even though not in the home port of the ship.

Our policy was to have the ships struck where they lay except, of course, any ship that was in a foreign port, and she was to be sailed back home to the first American port and struck there.

I believe, if my memory is good on the point, that Innes advocated a program of sailing the ships back to their home ports, which we were opposed to.

Q. What would be the significance of such a policy?

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Mr. Del Guercio: If your Honor please, I submit that such a matter is remote and unimportant.

[5570]

Presiding Inspector: I don't see why we should go into that.

Mr. Del Guercio: I thought we were trying to proceed expeditiously.

Presiding Inspector: You have got the facts. Why go any further? We are not trying this strike.

Mr. Gladstein: No, no; of course not. But I wish to state the materiality of this.

I now propose to show, on this issue, and also on another issue which occurred relatively early during the strike, quite a bit before December, before the Madison Square Garden meeting, that Mr. Innes was in rather vigorous opposition to Mr. Bridges—

Presiding Inspector: You have shown that.

Mr. Gladstein: But I wish to show that the significance of those disagreements is so great that your Honor can draw from that fact what we consider appropriate inferences as to whether Mr. Innes could possibly, conceivably have been entrusted with the kind of a telephone conversation which he described in this case.

Mr. Del Guercio: I think that argument—

Presiding Inspector: I—

Mr. Del Guercio (Continuing): —is so far-fetched, your Honor, that—excuse me.

Presiding Inspector: I was going to say that

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

I didn't see how it could lead to any such conclusion. Supposing it [5571] establishes and is absolutely essential to what Mr. Bridges thought was the well being of his union in this strike, what difference would it make beyond the fact that they were in conflict?

Mr. Gladstein: Suppose, your Honor, that the disagreement between Mr. Bridges and Mr. Innes was one which was known to and shared by, say, Mr. Curran, in New York, or other members of the Strike Committee in New York; suppose there had been even correspondence exchanged on that subject. By proving that such disagreements occurred, and the significance of those disagreements, and that there was correspondence between the east and west on that, it would definitely tend to show the position that Mr. Innes occupied, the way in which he was regarded by these same people who he says impressed him with this kind of highly confidential telephone conversation.

Presiding Inspector: You want to pile inference on inference.

Mr. Gladstein: Here is an analogy: As you will recall Mr. McCuiston said, after he had been expelled from the Communist Party, after he had been expelled, he claimed he was regarded in greater and higher confidence than when he was in the Communist Party; and that after he was expelled he was entrusted with the kind of highly confidential matters that he, as a member of the Communist Party, hadn't been entrusted with. I

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

think those are things for the trier of the fact to evaluate. [5572] I think we are entitled to show what position a witness actually occupied in this strike.

Presiding Inspector: You want to draw the inference, from a result of this quarrel in the strike, that Mr. Curran wasn't in a position, or wouldn't naturally communicate with Mr. Innes, and then from that you want to draw the inference that he came up to San Francisco and saw Mr. Bridges on different matters, or something of that kind?

Mr. Gladstein: No. Your Honor hasn't stated the point correctly. You see—

Presiding Inspector: I meant to state it.

Mr. Gladstein: As Mr. Innes and Mr. McCuistion described it—this is my recollection and it is not offered as a substitute for the testimony, but this is my remembrance in summary of what they said: Mr. McCuistion and Mr. Innes in effect said that at a time when neither of them was a member of the Communist Party—in fact, Mr. Innes never claimed to have been a member of the Community Party and never took orders from it, he claimed—and Mr. McCuistion, who had been in the Communist Party, had been expelled from it. At such a time when neither of them was in the Communist Party they would have the Court believe that the Communist Party entrusted them with a highly confidential telephone conversation for the purpose of having Mr. Bridges come back east.



(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Now, I think that we are entitled to show, apart from [5573] what we consider the inherent credibility of that character of testimony, we are entitled to show the actual position occupied by these men in the strike to additionally reveal to the trier of the fact that no credibility can attach to that kind of testimony; and, therefore, we have a right to show, I believe, that disagreements occurred on various strike issues which were significant disagreements, and the result of which was that correspondence was exchanged between the east and the west raising this whole question of the alleged irresponsibility of Mr. Innes, the alleged untrustworthiness of the man, that he wasn't properly carrying out the policies of the West Coast Strike Committee, and wasn't properly carrying out instructions from the east, all for the purpose of showing that picture from which you have a right to conclude, and we think you should conclude, that this telephone conversation was not a genuine, bona fide telephone conversation.

We have a right to make that contention, and to offer proof in support of that contention. And that, frankly, is our purpose.

Mr. Del Guercio: Counsel has conveniently failed to mention that after Mr. McCuiston was expelled from the Communist Party that, through the Communist Party, Mr. McCuiston enlisted in the Spanish cause, went over there and fought for the Communist Party and was wounded twice; that he carried funds [5574] of the Communist Party,

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

entrusted to him by the Communist Party in New York, funds not only for the recruits that he was in charge of, but funds destined to a Communist Party member in Paris, France, and they say that McCuiston isn't to be believed, that he wasn't closely associated with the Communist Party after he had been expelled. [5575]

Presiding Inspector: Well, that was merely an argument of his general position. I will take the proof.

Mr. Gladstein: I can put it in this form.

Presiding Inspector: No, no. Ask the—have the question—

Mr. Gladstein: I was going to put the question.

Presiding Inspector: You can put it again, of course.

Mr. Del Guercio: I just mentioned that, your Honor, as being the gratitude of the Communist Party as they expressed it.

Presiding Inspector: We are not trying the Communist Party either.

Mr. Del Guercio: Well, we are trying the Communist Party here.

Presiding Inspector: No. We are trying Mr. Bridges—

Mr. Del Guercio (Interposing): As a member of the Communist Party.

Presiding Inspector: At least we are hearing about the question of Mr. Bridges as it comes

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

within the condemnation of the deportation law. That is all we are trying really, anyway.

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. Now, Mr. Bridges, will you state what significance, if any, there was with specific relationship to the successful outcome of the 1936 strike to this agreement between your [5576] position and the position of Mr. Innes on where ships from other home ports should be struck.

Mr. Del Guercio: I will object to that.

Presiding Inspector: Hasn't he covered that?

Mr. Gladstein: He hasn't stated what the significance was, whether it was important or whether it was a minor and trivial thing.

Presiding Inspector: Isn't that something that we can tell just as well as Mr. Bridges?

Mr. Gladstein: I don't think that anybody reading the record and having just that much would necessarily know that that was an important thing or an unimportant thing.

Presiding Inspector: I should think anyone reading the record would know it. But you may show it.

Mr. Gladstein: If your Honor is satisfied—

Presiding Inspector (Interposing): Go ahead. Ask it.

Mr. Gladstein: I did. I did ask it.

Presiding Inspector: Let Mr. Bridges answer.

A. Well, the effect of the issue itself would be, of course, to prolong the strike for the reason that it would take two or three months to even get the

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

strike going or to get it tightened up. On this specific case there were two or three positions. I can't exactly recall where Innes was on the first position, but we finally got it straightened out.

[5577]

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. Was there any other issue on which there was disagreement between Mr. Innes and yourself or Mr. Curran? A. Yes.

Q. What?

Mr. Del Guercio: We object, of course, to all this line.

Presiding Inspector: Certainly. Certainly.

A. Very early in the strike the issue of removing perishable goods from the ships that were tied up—our policy was to remove them, such as refrigerated goods, fruits and perishable types of cargo that was stored in the refrigerators aboard the ships. And inasmuch as the crews had been withdrawn from the ships there was nobody to operate the refrigerating machinery and those goods would rot away.

Our policy was to—even though the strike was on, to supply men to remove those goods. Innes was in opposition to that.

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. What was the importance in respect to the possible winning of the strike of whether or not refrigerated goods should be removed from the ships? A. We didn't accomplish—

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Mr. Del Guercio (Interposing): I would object to that as calling for pure speculation.

Presiding Inspector: I will take it. I think it is [5578] pretty speculative.

Mr. Gladstein: I beg your pardon?

Presiding Inspector: I think it is pretty speculative, but I will take it. It is his conclusion on things that never happened, and his policy was this. He stated it, but he may answer, if he wants to venture a conclusion on that.

A. (Continuing): There were two or three reasons. Some of these goods were aboard—

Presiding Inspector (Interposing): Read the question. I don't know that I have it in mind.

(Whereupon the question referred to was read by the reporter as follows

“Q. What was the importance in respect to the possible winning of the strike of whether or not refrigerated goods should be removed from the ships?”)

Presiding Inspector: What was the importance toward winning the strike?

A. (Continuing): Well, it had a bearing. Some of these such goods were aboard ships that were subsidized by the United States Government and the authorities in Washington were threatening to remove those goods, and eventually, as a matter of fact, the Marshal in Los Angeles Harbor was ordered through some kind of a warrant to remove certain perishable goods. It was a cargo of bananas from one of the ships, and the situa-

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

tion could have been threatening and damaging to our strike. We were sacrificing [5579] public opinion with no good coming out of it. And, after all, the goods and the food was going to waste and was rotting.

The way it finally wound up, the various committees argued so long that by the time they decided on the policy, which was not to remove the goods, the stuff had rotted away and gone bad anyhow.

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. Now, is there any other issue on which you and Mr. Innes were in disagreement?

A. Yes. The formation in San Pedro of a group of men that he was working with and leading as a group separate and apart from the other body of strikers. He had his own committee, his own commissary, and soup kitchen and such things as that; his own little set-up.

Q. What was the importance—withdraw that.

Were you opposed to Mr. Innes conducting that kind of separate soup kitchen, commissary and other aspects of the strike involving the East Coast men who were in San Pedro?

A. Yes. We believed that the best way to handle the whole thing and that made for greater unity and solidarity was to handle the whole thing as one group of strikers, seamen and longshoremen, East Coast and West Coast men combined, and not as groups, from this, that, or the other part of the nation.



(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Q. Now, on that subject matter do you recall whether correspondence in the form of teletypes or any other form took place between the East and West with respect to any con- [5580] fusion that was caused by the manner in which Mr. Innes conducted this separate group in San Pedro?

A. We notified the East Coast that unless Innes was ordered to cease the policies or attempt to carry out these certain policies that we would have nothing to do with him and would not work with him in any way.

Mr. Gladstein: While counsel is examining that, I want to say that there will be various teletypes or telegrams introduced or perhaps additional letters. Will the same understanding prevail, that we will have the right to withdraw the originals upon the substitution of photostats made by the Court Reporter?

Presiding Inspector: Why, of course, unless there is some doubt as to their authenticity and they want to examine into that.

Mr. Gladstein: We have no objection to that.

Mr. Del Guercio: We do. We want to reserve that.

Presiding Inspector: You have a right to do that, of course, just as that same privilege was allowed to Mr. Gladstein.

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. Now, Mr. Bridges, I show you what appears to be a teletype message under date of November

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

21st and ask you if you can identify it as a teletype actually sent and received on the West Coast with respect to the question of confusion caused by the manner in which Mr. Innes was conducting the [5581] East Coast strikers' group in San Pedro.

Mr. Del Guercio: If your Honor please, I object to the question, to the form of it and giving it at this time. He is showing here the Alien here a telegram that is complete, apparently, in itself. And so is interpreting it for the witness before he asks a question on it, and I submit that that is out of place.

Presiding Inspector: I don't think it will do any harm, though, Mr. Del Guercio. All the question is whether he identifies this.

Mr. Gladstein: That is right.

Mr. Del Guercio: Why couldn't—

Presiding Inspector (Interposing): Well, I don't know.

Mr. Del Guercio: Why all the preliminary?

Presiding Inspector: That is his way, and we can't—

Mr. Del Guercio (Interposing): I think it is highly objectionable.

Presiding Inspector: Even if we might want to make him over we couldn't do it. He has a right to present his case in his own way.

All you want about this is whether he identifies it.

Mr. Gladstein: I might state that my purpose

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

in having the question phrased so as to make it significant and whole in and of itself' is because when you read a record, and I have read many transcripts of trials, if you do not put the facts fully enough in a question the answer "Yes" or "No" [5582] may be meaningless and you may have to search all through the record and find difficulty in connecting up that question or that answer with the subject matter that you are interested in having brought out. And I therefore have learned from experience that it is best to put these things in a question with sufficient detail so that there can't be any argument later on as to what the record means.

Mr. Del Guercio: The question is not the answer.

Presiding Inspector: Do you recognize its having been received?

A. Yes. This is a carbon copy.

Presiding Inspector: You know about it personally?

The Witness: Yes. This is a carbon copy. This is not the original. The original is on white paper as it comes out of the teletype and this is a carbon, and I recognize this as having been received by our Strike Committee.

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. Do you know here you were at the time this was received?

A. I would have to check that. I have got records to show whether I was in San Francisco. Possibly I was in San Francisco at that time.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Mr. Gladstein: I offer this in evidence and call your Honor's attention to a portion of it.

Mr. Del Guercio: Just a minute! I object to that. [5583] No proper foundation has been laid for the introduction of it in evidence.

Presiding Inspector: I haven't seen it.

(The proffered Exhibit was passed to the Presiding Inspector.)

Mr. Del Guercio: It isn't addressed to Mr. Bridges, it isn't signed by Mr. Bridges.

Mr. Gladstein: I can lay a more complete foundation, your Honor, as to where these teletype machines were.

Mr. Del Guercio: I think we should have Mr. Rathborne on the stand to identify it.

Presiding Inspector: Well, I don't see how a teletype from Mr. Rathborne is of any importance here.

Mr. Gladstein: Well, that teletype—

Presiding Inspector (Interposing): This was both received and sent on the Pacific Coast, as I understand it.

Mr. Gladstein: That was and makes reference to a communication sent from the East Coast to the West Coast.

Presiding Inspector: Yes.

Mr. Gladstein: I will do this before ask—

Presiding Inspector (Interposing): I don't know what these letters really mean.

Mr. Gladstein: I will ask the witness about that.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. Mr. Bridges, will you describe what the teletype [5584] set-up was during the 1936 strike with reference to the various cities in which they were located—the machines, that is—and the offices in which they were located and how communication over the teletype machines took place.

Mr. Del Guercio: I will object to that as being four or five questions in one.

Presiding Inspector: I think that is all right. I will allow that. Go ahead.

A. We had a teletype network. San Francisco, Portland, Seattle and San Pedro was connected by teletype, and San Francisco and New York and Los Angeles and New York. The teletypes were in the various Union offices. In San Francisco the teletype was in my office, and when a teletype came in the girl receiving it—the teletypes were not received personally by myself operating the machine or Rathborne or any of the other officials. There were received by a girl operating the machine and she would sign off on our name or whoever received or whoever the message was intended for. Then later, of course, Innes had his own apparatus in Los Angeles or San Pedro where he set up a teletype machine in his separate committee quarters or strike quarters down there, and these messages, of course, passed around the network and were relayed on. If they happened to come through from New York to Los Angeles they would be relayed up to

(Testimony of Harry Rentón Bridges.)

San Francisco. If they happened to come from New York to San Francisco they would be relayed down [5585] to San Pedro, because sometimes New York might call on account of the difference in time and they mightn't find the particular person or somebody of sufficient importance in the office. They might be at a meeting somewhere. Therefore, they would switch the call to San Francisco and we would relay on and at the same time we would understand and know what the messages were as they passed through.

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. Now, was the teletype in the San Francisco office used by and in the offices of yourself only or yourself and anybody else?

A. Myself and Rathborne. But the teletype was located in—we had three offices and the teletype was located in the center office and operated by my secretary.

Q. What was your—withdraw that.

Did you hold any position in the District Council at that time? A. President.

Q. That is the District Council of the Maritime Federation?

A. Of San Francisco Bay Area, yes.

Q. And who was the Secretary?

A. Rathborne.

Mr. Gladstein: Now, I think with that basis, your Honor, [5586] that the witness is qualified to identify this as a teletype.



(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Mr. Del Guercio: If your Honor please, I don't believe by the witness' own statement that he is qualified. He didn't see this come in, he wasn't there when it came in. He can't testify as to where it came from. He says he don't use the teletype machine himself. That is delegated to the secretary, Mr. Rathborne.

Mr. Gladstein: He didn't say that. He said the girl in his office actually operated the machine.

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. When you said "the girl in the office"—

Mr. Del Guercio: (Interposing) And that thing can be typed off a machine as well as a teletype.

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. Mr. Bridges, when you said "the girl in the office" to whom did you have reference?

A. My secretary.

Q. The stenographer?

A. Not necessarily. When a teletype came through there might have been three of us standing around the machine reading the message as it was typed on the machine. Rathborne, being the Secretary, would generally sign communications, if he was there at all. In other words, when we received this and I was standing there and two or three other people, we wouldn't sign "Bridges, Rathborne and Joe Blow". We would sign one name. [5587] Teletypes cost money and we would sign "Rathborne". That's the way these things came through. It is entirely possible that when this teletype came

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Through I was standing right by the machine with Rathborne watching the message come through.

Q. How many teletype messages would you estimate were sent and received in the San Francisco office for the duration of the strike?

A. Several daily, from all points. That would be West Coast points as well as East Coast points.

Q. Now, after the strike or during the strike what arrangements, if you know, were made to keep files of the various teletypes that had been received or sent in the San Francisco office?

A. They were filed; maybe not very efficiently, but we filed them away in the cellar some way.

Q. This teletype that I have just handed you, did it come from one of the files into which were placed such of the teletypes as were kept in the 1936 strike?

Mr. Del Guercio: I will object to the question. We are interested in this particular teletype.

Mr. Gladstein: I said that. I asked him that.

Presiding Inspector: I will take it.

A. Yes. I procured that myself. I searched the records myself.

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. Now, when the teletype was sent, Mr. Bridges, [5588] would you describe, please, the way in which a conversation could be held over the teletype machine.

Mr. Del Guercio: I will object to that as being immaterial and not laying a foundation for the admission of the document.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Presiding Inspector: I will take that. This is the general teletype operation.

A. Two or three ways. You could dictate a message. If it was a long statement and going a long way, such as New York, the best and efficient and cheapest way was to dictate the statement that you were going to make first and then you could edit it and you could eliminate all the unnecessary words and the girl could type it faster. If it were a shorter or long message you could stand at the teletype while the girl was sending the message and tell her what you wanted sent as she sent it.

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. Now, did it sometimes occur that—withdraw that.

How would a connection between the San Francisco office and any of the other places to which San Francisco was connected by teletype be made?

A. You would call their call number on the teletype.

Q. After that connection was made was it possible for a two-way conversation to take place; that is to say, for one of the stations to speak in writing or in written form to the other and then receive an answer or further questions [5589] from the other end and carry it back and forth that way?

A. That's right. We used to even hold meetings on the teletype. We would have four or five stations on. We would have San Pedro, Portland, San Francisco, New York maybe, and Seattle all listening in at the same time and all talking backwards and forwards.

(Testimony of Harry. Renton Bridges.)

Q. Would it—withdraw that.

Now, during the strike were teletypes filed away in the Maritime Federation office that showed conversations that were held between San Francisco and other ports? A. Yes.

Q. Did those teletypes show conversations alternately; that is to say, where the San Francisco office would be speaking in written form and then the other office would speak and then back to San Francisco, and so forth?

Mr. Del Guercio: I will object to that question, if your Honor please.

Presiding Inspector: This is the operation of the teletype.

Mr. Gladstein: That's right.

Presiding Inspector: I will take it.

A. That's right. That's the way it works. [5590]

Mr. Gladstein: I think there has been sufficient identification of this teletype and I renew my offer, your Honor.

Presiding Inspector: Are these teletypes signed?

Mr. Gladstein: You mean in handwriting?

Presiding Inspector: In general?

The Witness: No.

Presiding Inspector: Do they bear a signature?

The Witness: In some cases they bear a signature spelled out; and in some cases they bear the initials; and in some cases they bear dates. It was generally our practice that the only signing done was by the written teletype, and unless the date was

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

not typed at the time, the girl penciled or inked the date in.

Presiding Inspector: Is that the signature of the receiver or sender?

The Witness: The signature of both. In other words, when the call, when somebody was calling to San Francisco, for example, they type in, well, this is such and such a number, Portland, calling; and they would ask for who they wanted to speak to, maybe such and such a number in San Francisco; and they would say who was calling, and they would sign their name, spell out their name, or give their initials; and the person receiving the message would do likewise. That is to say, this is so and so speaking, and when they sign off they sign off the same way. [5591]

Presiding Inspector: Let me see it.

(The document referred to was passed to the Presiding Inspector.)

Mr. Gladstein: I might say, your Honor——

Presiding Inspector: I don't understand it, not the words, but I don't understand the process, as to where the name of the sender is on this.

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. Would you explain that further——

First, let me ask this, your Honor: I realize I can't duplicate for the record what a teletype machine is like, and so on. But if your Honor is not familiar with it——

7

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Presiding Inspector: I am entirely unfamiliar with it.

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. Mr. Bridges, would you describe the teletype machine itself, and what it looks like, as the thing is being operated, and a message is being sent, say, from San Francisco to Portland; and then how Portland can send its message to San Francisco?

Mr. Del Guercio: If your Honor please, as long as counsel is suggesting this form of a question I can make a suggestion, too, and I think it will clear this up. It is possible, as I understand it, for a teletype machine to make one of these copies without communicating with anybody. You could practice on the teletype sending messages. [5592]

Presiding Inspector: When I have looked into it I will probably take judicial notice of the operation of the teletype, but at the moment I am entirely in the dark on it.

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. Will you proceed, Mr. Bridges?

A. A teletype is just like a typewriter, except that to the back of it is attached a long roll of paper, this type of paper (indicating), excepting it is in a long roll. As you type a message on the teletype it writes it on this paper, and at the same time transmits it by telegraph to the point you are talking to. Then when you get through sending your message the party on the other end responds and your teletype moves, and the message appears



(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

before you," and the keys on the teletype move as if an invisible hand was typing them.

Presiding Inspector: You tear it off?

The Witness: Yes. This is part of a long roll. We still have in our files long rolls of these teletypes, six or eight feet long.

Of course, the message is sent like this message is sent, they have a call number.

The number here, call letters here, are "Marfed". That designates the station in San Pedro that is sending it. It is "Marfed."

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. That stands for what? [5593]

A. Maritime Federation.

Mr. Del Guercio: Of course, if these questions are directed to qualifying the witness as an expert we would like to question him also on the teletype machine.

Presiding Inspector: I don't think this is an expert matter. It is just the use of a familiar instrument, familiar to most people, but I never happened to have had any experience with the teletype.

Mr. Gladstein: Actually, your Honor, it is an attempt to—

Presiding Inspector: I wouldn't explain it.

Go ahead, Mr. Bridges. I will take it. You have given, or said that "Marfed" means San Pedro.

The Witness: "Marfed" meant San Pedro at that time; yes, sir.

Then the individual's name is signed here, "Jordan."

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Jordan, I know, was the Secretary of the Strike Committee at that time.

"Marfed", that is a mistake. "Marfed" was San Francisco and not San Pedro. If I said San Pedro before that is incorrect. "Marfed" was our call, San Francisco. That was because San Francisco was the head office, and where we had our headquarters, and "Marfed" meant Maritime Federation Headquarters. I didn't mean to say San Pedro.

Mr. Del Guercio: I think we are getting away from the [5594] real issue at point here.

Presiding Inspector: They are trying to explain to me how a teletype works.

Mr. Del Guercio: But the teletype hasn't been identified as having been received—purported to have been sent.

Presiding Inspector: He said to the best of his recollection it was received. He didn't say about the date.

Mr. Gladstein: He said that he obtained this from a file in which was kept, not all—

Mr. Del Guercio: (Interposing) From a file? Taken from the teletype.

Mr. Gladstein: He said he obtained this document from a file.

Presiding Inspector: I know what he said. I can't understand still who it went to, or where it was sent, or where it came from.

The Witness: As a matter of fact, during the strike there was some inexperienced people on the other

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

end sending a lot of these messages and we had a tough time understanding some of them ourselves.

In regard to this particular message I know it was ultimately transmitted by telegraph and the official telegram, or a copy of the telegram appears in the minutes of the Strike Committee around this date. That is the text of that teletype. [5595]

Mr. Del Guercio: It is more confusing than it ever was, if your Honor please.

Mr. Gladstein: This is simply as he recollects it. He has an independent recollection, in addition to the document that he has been talking about, an independent recollection that the subject matter of the document was also the subject matter of the telegram, and that it came in and became a part of the official minutes of the union.

Mr. Myron: So probably it wasn't a teletype message at all.

Presiding Inspector: You can have both, you know.

Mr. Gladstein: I renew my offer.

Presiding Inspector: You offer the document?

Mr. Gladstein: Yes.

Presiding Inspector: Have it marked for identification and let me ask some questions about it.

Mr. Gladstein: All right.

(The document referred to was marked for identification as Alién's Exhibit No. 33.)

Presiding Inspector: Does the signature on this instrument—I call it an instrument—this paper,

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

which is Alien's Exhibit 33 for identification; that name at the end, does that purport, as you understand the teletype practice, to be the sender or the receiver?

The Witness: Here? (Indicating). [5596]

Presiding Inspector: Yes.

The Witness: That is the sender.

Presiding Inspector: Where was it received?

The Witness: San Francisco. First of all is the call.

Presiding Inspector: Can you tell where it was sent from?

The Witness: San Pedro—"San Pedro. O.K. End."

Here is the message here (indicating) and that is the end of the message.

Presiding Inspector: It is a message from—

The Witness: (Interposing) Jordan.

Presiding Inspector: From someone in San Pedro named Jordan?

The Witness: Yes.

Presiding Inspector: To the San Francisco office of the Strike Committee, and received by Rathborne?

The Witness: That is right. And these letters that appear here (indicating) are some code letters that we had that I forget the meaning of them; I can recall the meaning of these (indicating) code letters here, but these code letters appearing before and after Jordan's name, I forget the meaning, what they really meant at that time, now.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

But that is the way the message came. It is a message to Rathborne. Rathborne replies and signs off; and then Jordan replies again and signs off.

[5597]

Jordan was the Secretary of the Los Angeles Strike Committee and he is sending the message to the Maritime Federation Headquarters in San Francisco, which was my office at that time.

Presiding Inspector: What was Innes doing at that time? What was his position with this Strike Committee?

The Witness: Innes, he had no position with our Strike Committee. He had his own separate Strike Committee. That is what the complaint was. We complained to the East Coast, and this was in answer to it.

Presiding Inspector: That was a committee of what?

The Witness: Innes' committee?

Presiding Inspector: Yes.

The Witness: Merely a committee of men who had walked off East Coast ships, meaning ships whose home port was on the East Coast.

Presiding Inspector: They weren't members of your local lodges?

The Witness: They were members of the East Coast—they belonged on two big ships laying in the port of San Pedro, members of two big passenger ships laying in San Pedro. There were about 300 all told. He took these people and set up separate strike headquarters, and a separate Strike Com-



(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

missary, teletype system, and all the rest, and that was what the complaint was about. This is a teletype instructing Innes and [5598] notifying us.

Mr. Gladstein: I renew the offer.

Presiding Inspector: That is a communication between two people, neither of whom are present, reporting a further communication from a man who has been sworn here as a witness. Now, what point is there in this?

Mr. Gladstein: I will be very happy to tell you.

In the first place, this teletype, as described by the witness, appears by his testimony to have been brought into existence, sent and received, and sent back, and so on, in the manner in which he described it in the usual and ordinary course of the business of operating the teletype in connection with the business of operating a strike on the West Coast in 1936. It deals with a subject matter concerning which this witness has testified and concerning which Mr. Innes testified. And I remind your Honor that Mr. Innes admitted, when he was on the stand, that he was involved in an altercation—

Presiding Inspector: Then why do you need anything more?

Mr. Gladstein: I would like to have the facts because he places his own interpretation on it. I think he said he was almost thrown out of the union—I don't purport to quote him—he said he had quite a disagreement on this very same issue of the way in which he was conducting the San Pedro Hall for the East Coast men. Now, Mr. Innes made



(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

this interpretation of it: That he, Mr. Innes, was conducting himself in that way [5599] because he refused to place those east coast men under the domination of the West Coast Unions, which he called Communist-dominated. That is his testimony here today.

We wish to show, not only by the testimony of Mr. Bridges, and by the testimony which Mr. Curran has already given, but by records which came into existence as a part of the ordinary course of the strike.—

Presiding Inspector: I don't see that it helps you. Now, you want this as a hearsay statement of what Mr. Curran communicated.—

Mr. Del Guercio: Jordan.

Presiding Inspector: (Continuing) —to Rathborne.

Mr. Gladstein: Is your Honor raising the objection that this is hearsay?

Presiding Inspector: Well, it is triple hearsay, isn't it?

Mr. Gladstein: I made that objection before when the Government was putting in hearsay, and I think I said it was triple hearsay, and you allowed it.

Mr. Del Guercio: Not on the introduction of documents.

Presiding Inspector: It should at least be given by word of mouth, so you could test at least one witness on it. We haven't Mr. Jordan or we haven't Mr. Rathborne.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Mr. Del Guercio: Mr. Rathborne is available.

Mr. Gladstein: There are a great many of these documents; [5600] these teletypes, which were received and filed away. And I say they came into existence in a manner in which Mr. Bridges testified.

If your Honor is going to invoke a technical rule to exclude this evidence it seems to me that—

Presiding Inspector: I am not invoking any rule—

Mr. Gladstein: (Continuing)—it would not be consistent with the liberal rulings you have heretofore made when we objected.

Presiding Inspector: First, I think it is only remotely relevant anyway. It seems to me that such a teletype message has no particular point. You have got the testimony of Mr. Curran.

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. I will put it in this form: Mr. Bridges, I want to ask you whether you know if, during the 1936 strike Mr. Curran, in response to protests from the West Coast, notified the West that, having received information that Peter Innes was causing confusion, Mr. Curran, under the circumstances, called on the West Coast Strike Committee to instruct Innes that he, Innes, was to work completely under the jurisdiction of the Joint Strike Committee and not as an individual.

Mr. Del Guercio: I will object to that.

Presiding Inspector: You claim he knew it. He may have read it in the newspaper. [5601]

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Mr. Gladstein: It makes no difference, if he got the information.

Presiding Inspector: Yes it does. He can't tell his knowledge of a fact of that kind without giving the source. Of course, if this really had any immediate pertinence why we might overlook all these things.

Mr. Gladstein: It has two points of materiality: One is—

Presiding Inspector: You told us about that.

Mr. Gladstein: I have only discussed one.

The other, it is a question of the state of mind of Mr. Bridges with respect to Mr. Innes.

Presiding Inspector: How is that material?

Mr. Gladstein: Because if Mr. Bridges was of the opinion, and had the attitude at that time that Mr. Innes was causing confusion by a disruptive program, was not carrying out a program which had been agreed to by the unions involved, so much so that Mr. Bridges participated in a complaint to the East Coast about Innes, Mr. Bridges would be in a position to state what his attitude was toward Innes.

Presiding Inspector: I have already allowed that.

Mr. Gladstein: But on this specific subject you have not?

Presiding Inspector: It doesn't make any difference what the subject is. His attitude is all we need, isn't it? As far as that is concerned, we have already got it in the case. [5602]

Mr. Gladstein: I know, but the basis for a per-

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

son's attitude, the specific events which substantiate that attitude, which make that attitude understandable and logical, that, to the trier of the fact, is important. Otherwise, all you are allowing us to do is to give the empty shell of a generalization and we are not content with that. We believe we should have the picture, all the facts.

Presiding Inspector: I notice that. You see, this matter strikes me of very little importance, in view of what you have already got. But if you think that anything is added by this you can call Mr. Rathborne, and you can call Mr. Jordan.

Mr. Gladstein: There are teletype messages during this particular strike to which signatures appear of perhaps twenty different people. Is it your Honor's position that we have to call all those twenty people in order to establish something that Mr. Bridges is certainly qualified to discuss?

Presiding Inspector: Of which he has already told at this hearing.

Mr. Gladstein: Which is the point? First, you say—

Presiding Inspector: I don't know what the point is.

Mr. Gladstein: I am asking you what the point of your objection is.

Presiding Inspector: First, that it doesn't come within earshot of proof, legal proof. It is a message on a piece of paper here which undoubtedly, according to the testimony of [5603] Mr. Bridges, and I have no reason to doubt it, is a teletype message received by Mr. Rathborne from Mr. Jordan.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Now, there the whole thing is. We don't know whether Mr. Jordan was correct. He is giving something there that he is quoting. But we don't know what he is quoting it from, how they received it, what was the point of it, or anything else.

Mr. Gladstein: Some of these teletypes, your Honor, we did not have in court on the day that Peter Innes testified; some of the teletypes that we are interested in introducing in evidence came from Innes, or were sent to Innes—at least Innes was involved in a two-way conversation. According to your theory it would then be incumbent on us to secure Mr. Innes, or the other party, or parties, to whom he was talking, because there may have been quite a number, in order to identify those teletypes.

Presiding Inspector: We will come to that question when you produce those messages.

Mr. Gladstein: I am simply following out to its logical conclusion the theory of your objection.

Presiding Inspector: You have several times objected to what you called triple hearsay.

Mr. Gladstein: I don't so consider this. I have objected to what I called triple hearsay when the Government attempted to introduce such evidence, and it is my recollection that the Government was permitted to put it in. I don't just recall—[5604]

Presiding Inspector: I sustained your objection.

Mr. Grossman: No. Your Honor will remember Mr. Honig was testifying and he stated that in Moscow someone said that someone in the United States said that Harry Bridges was a Communist and that

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

was introduced and received against our objection.

There are other examples.

Mr. Chase testified that Mr. Hanoff told him that Bridges was a Communist.

Presiding Inspector: I have admitted hearsay on both sides of the table repeatedly. But as to this triple hearsay, Mr. Gladstein objected to it on that ground, and my recollection is that I sustained Mr. Gladstein.

Mr. Grossman: We have not won any victory at all on hearsay objections.

Presiding Inspector: I beg your pardon. My recollection is different. You may be right, but I think you have.

Mr. Gladstein: If we have won a victory on objections to Government hearsay testimony it would have to be on fourth hearsay, and not on third.

Mr. Del Guercio: Now, that is very nice of you and——

Presiding Inspector: I think I will answer Mr. Gladstein, if he needs any answer.

Go ahead and ask your next question.

Mr. Gladstein: I had a question pending. May I have it [5605] read?

Presiding Inspector: We will never finish this case if we are going to discuss each instrument that you bring in of this kind.

Mr. Gladstein: Well, your Honor, I would like to accommodate you. We didn't bring this case in the first place. We think it is an outrage that the case was ever brought in the first place.

Presiding Inspector: I am not interested in that.



(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Mr. Gladstein: We want to make our defense.

Presiding Inspector: ~~You know that I didn't~~ bring this case either, and I am not interested in who brought it, and I think there should be no comment of that kind from counsel.

You may have your question read.

(The question referred to was read by the reporter as follows:

"Q. I will put it in this form: Mr. Bridges, I want to ask you whether you know if, during the 1936 strike Mr. Curran, in response to protests from the West Coast, notified the West that, having received information that Peter Innes was causing confusion, Mr. Curran, under the circumstances, called on the West Coast Strike Committee to instruct Innes that he, Innes, was to work completely under the jurisdiction of the Joint Strike Committee and not as an individual?")

Presiding Inspector: Before you answer that question, [5606] did you have any information that you received from Mr. Curran, or did you have any direct telephonic or teletypic communication on the subject?

The Witness: I know all about it, your Honor, and it is my recollection that we didn't only receive it by telephone, by telegram and by teletype, but I was involved in it and it is a matter of official record in the minutes of the Committee at that time.

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. Did you have any personal discussions with Mr. Innes on the subject?

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

A. Very definitely I did, right in my office.

Mr. Del Guercio: Your Honor, there hasn't been a ruling on my objection.

Presiding Inspector: I overruled the objection—  
I overrule the objection.

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. Now, do you have in mind the question that I asked you—

A. (Interposing): Yes.

Q. What is the answer to that question?

A. That is correct; he did.

Mr. Gladstein: Will you allow us a recess now?

Presiding Inspector: Yes; certainly.

(Whereupon a short recess was taken.) [5607]

Mr. Gladstein: Are you ready, your Honor?

Presiding Inspector: Yes.

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. Now, Mr. Bridges, did you ever have conversations—personal conversations—with Mr. Innes in which there was disagreement between the two of you over the question of Mr. Innes' operation of the or conduct of the East Coast strikers' problems in San Pedro?

Mr. Del Guercio: I will object to that, if your Honor please. If it goes to the bias of the witness, of course, it will also show the bias of this witness equally.

Mr. Gladstein: Then I don't see why the Government should object.

Presiding Inspector: I will take it.

A. Yes.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. What were they?

Presiding Inspector: Now, are you contradicting Innes without giving him an opportunity to explain?

Mr. Gladstein: Giving whom an opportunity to explain?

Presiding Inspector: You are now asking for a conversation with Innes going to his credibility.

Mr. Gladstein: Yes.

Presiding Inspector: Shouldn't you have asked him about it? [5608]

Mr. Gladstein: No, I don't think we are confined to offering this merely by way of impeachment.

Presiding Inspector: Isn't that the point?

Mr. Gladstein: It may follow that he is impeached, but that isn't necessarily the rule of evidence to which the introduction—

Presiding Inspector (Interposing): No, no. I thought that was the sole purpose of it.

Mr. Gladstein: We think that it would have that effect, but we think it is admissible simply as part of the situation as it actually developed and as the witness can describe it to show again the state of mind of Mr. Bridges as of that time with respect to Mr. Innes; that is, Mr. Bridges' attitude and so on, all for the purpose of advising your Honor as to whether it would be conceivable or credible that Mr. Bridges could be involved in this kind of a telephone conversation that was testified to and to which I am coming later.

A. The conversations were notifying him that we

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

would not put up with the actions and the policies that he was——

Mr. Del Guercio (Interposing): Speak a little louder, please.

A. (Continuing): ——guilty of, and he was notified by me that unless something was done about it, why, he would be excluded from our committee meetings. And he was excluded [5609] from one and it eventually resulted in him being ordered to work under our instructions.

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. By whom was he so ordered, if you know?

A. By Joe Curran.

Q. Now, I show you a letter, which I have already shown counsel, under date of November 27, 1936 and ask you to identify it.

Mr. Del Guercio: Before the witness replies, if your Honor please, if it is the same letter that counsel showed me it is a mimeographed copy unsigned.

Mr. Gladstein: It bears a mimeographed signature, I believe, does it not?

The Witness: No.

Presiding Inspector: That seems to be signed. Isn't that signed?

Mr. Del Guercio: Sir?

Presiding Inspector: It seems to be signed.

The Witness: Not this one.

Mr. Del Guercio: It doesn't even have a mimeographed signature.

The Witness: There was a space left for signature. The copies that went out were signed. This copy didn't go out.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Mr. Myron: I object to this testimony in regard to the letter. [5610]

Mr. Gladstein: I think the witness has a right to identify the document.

Presiding Inspector: Oh, yes. He has a right to identify the document. I will allow him to identify it.

A. This was one of the official communications that was sent out at that time by the District Executive Board to all our locals reporting on events up to date and outlining future program in certain respects.

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. Now, the copy that you have in your hand appears not to have been signed. Can you explain why?

A. Well, because the only copies that were signed were the ones that went out. The ones that went into the files naturally didn't need any signature unless the stencil on which the letter was mimeographed was signed, and in this case it wasn't. We used both methods. Sometimes we signed the stencil, sometimes we leave the space for the signature and we sign every letter to the locals that go out separately. This is one of the latter ways of doing it. And undoubtedly the originals that went out were all signed by me, some twenty or thirty all told.

Q. Where did you obtain this particular document concerning which you have just testified?

A. From the official files of our organization.

Mr. Gladstein: Before I offer it in evidence I call your Honor's attention— [5611]

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Presiding Inspector (Interposing): Has it any purpose except to refresh the witness' recollection?

Mr. Gladstein: Well, he has already testified on the subject matter.

Presiding Inspector: Of course, I don't know what is in there.

Mr. Gladstein: Yes. I simply wanted to make this statement. The letter of November 27th, your Honor, has two references which are pertinent in view of the testimony that Mr. Bridges has given. One appears on page two and has reference to the fact, as stated in the letter, "that Joseph P. Ryan", and I think he has been identified as the then President of the International Longshoremen's Association, "was refusing to recognize the East Coast marine strike and was forcing the ILA men"—that refers to the longshoremen on the East Coast—"to work shifts despite the maritime workers' picket lines".

The other reference in which we are interested, your Honor, appears on page 3 and there it is stated that "The Executive Board", and that is referring to the Executive Board of the Pacific Coast District of the ILA, the group of which Mr. Bridges was President—"The Executive Board is also seriously considering sending a delegation to the East and Gulf Coasts in order to appeal to the longshoremen there to (illegible) the West Coast strike and the East Coast maritime [5612]

Presiding Inspector: Why is this any better than his testimony?

Mr. Gladstein: It is not better than his testimony.



(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

but it simply is written corroboration of his testimony.

Presiding Inspector: You can't show that he made similar statements at other times. That is elementary. With his statement, I don't think it is material:

Mr. Gladstein: This is the official statement of the International Longshoremen's Association of the Pacific Coast.

Presiding Inspector: I don't think there will be any question about this point, Mr. Gladstein. I think you are laboring the point here, which I don't think will be controverted.

Mr. Gladstein: I think this testimony controverts some evidence introduced by the Government.

Presiding Inspector: I don't think so, that delegations would be sent or that they were planning to send delegations if they needed them to encourage these co-strikers.

Mr. Gladstein: Well, I have in mind, your Honor, the testimony that Mr. Innes gave to this effect: That he said when he came up here in the early part of December—at one point in his testimony he said it was December 3rd or 4th, I believe, and later on he said “within the first week of December or possibly the last part of November”. He was a little vague about the date. But, as I say, at one point he [5613] said December 3rd or 4th. When he came up here to talk to Bridges about going back East—

Presiding Inspector (Interposing): If you want it, I will take it.

Mr. Gladstein: I want to explain it, your Honor.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Presiding Inspector: No. I don't think it is material. I don't think it is any better than his testimony, and I don't think it is necessarily controversial. This is, I don't think it is on a controversial subject.

Mr. Gladstein: Well, if you will let me finish—

Presiding Inspector: Surely. I will let you finish.

Mr. Gladstein: Mr. Innes said at that time, December 3rd or 4th, when he asked Mr. Bridges about going back to New York Mr. Bridges, he said, expressed himself this way: "I don't want to go into that mess back there. I'm not going back there". And then, you remember, Mr. Innes testified about a telephone conversation which Mr. Innes said was the cause of Mr. Bridges changing his mind.

Now, I am here trying to show, your Honor, by a series of documents, as well as the testimony, that Mr. Bridges' state of mind was and his acts were and the written evidence shows that at all times his was the policy, from at least November 19th on and even in prior discussions in a general way also, that he or a delegation of longshoremen—and, as it turns out, the only delegation, as we will show, consisted of him and those [5614] who went on this occasion—would go back East to speak to those mass meetings; that at all times that was his position, and, therefore, that this actual history based on these objective facts, this objective evidence, is inconsistent with the testimony of Mr. Innes and Mr. McCuiston to the effect that Mr. Bridges flatly refused to go, "refused to become involved in that mess back

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)  
there", and so on and so forth. I think that that is the theory on which we offer this evidence.

Mr. Myron: Of course; this is all argument based on incorrect statements of the record, and so forth.

Presiding Inspector: I will take it. I don't think it adds anything to the testimony already given. It is a self-serving declaration of this witness. But we are granting you very liberal interpretation of the rules. I will take it.

(The document referred to was received in evidence and marked Alien's Exhibit No. 34.)

Mr. Del Guercio: I wouldn't waste so much time if it wasn't for the fact that I suspect or anticipate that they will offer not only these but probably hundreds of these same things. That's the reason why I am urging these objections. Here, ordinarily, the document itself is innocuous.

Presiding Inspector: It seems to me so.

Mr. Del Guercio: That is the reason I am offering objections, but I don't want to lay the groundwork here for introducing others. [5615]

Presiding Inspector: It is perfectly proper for you to do that.

Mr. Del Guercio: I want to call the Court's attention that the one previously introduced bears the mimeographed signature of Mr. Bridges and also his initials "HRB". I suppose they are his initials. He doesn't testify that they are.

Presiding Inspector: Oh, yes, he does.

Mr. Del Guercio: And this one here bears no signature. Both of these documents have been in the

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

possession of the witness here since, well, I don't know how long. Now, we don't concede the authenticity of these documents. We don't have any way of knowing that they were written at the time he says they were. If they want to support, of course, the witness' oral testimony by matters of this kind, I don't know that we could stop them. But I say it serves no purpose at all as the Court has stated.

Presiding Inspector: I never supposed that supporting statements or statements to the same effect made at other times to other people are admissible unless you have proof that he made contradictory statements, and there is no proof that Mr. Bridges has made contradictory statements that I know of.

Mr. Gladstein: That is how I interpret Mr. Innes' testimony.

Presiding Inspector: Oh, no. They are not contradictory.

Mr. Gladstein: And Mr. McCuiston's testimony.

[5616]

Presiding Inspector: I think not.

Mr. Del Guercio: We can't proceed on counsel's interpretation of it.

Presiding Inspector: I will take those. I will take the teletype, too, that you put in. I think that is innocuous.

Mr. Myron: That is a carbon copy of what purports to be a teletype message?

Presiding Inspector: Yes.

Mr. Del Guercio: Without knowing where the original is.

Presiding Inspector: Yes.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

(The document referred to was received in evidence and marked ~~Alien's~~ Exhibit No. 33.)

The Witness: I think I have the original, your Honor.

Presiding Inspector: You have the original?

The Witness: I think so.

Presiding Inspector: Mr. Bridges thinks he has the original.

The Witness: It is on white paper.

Presiding Inspector: The teletype.

Mr. Del Guercio: Well, that is another ground for our objection to its admissibility, your Honor.

Presiding Inspector: Oh, no. I won't insist that you produce the original.

Mr. Del Guercio: Is that going to lay the groundwork [5617] for the introduction of these others?

Presiding Inspector: I suppose so. I think they are innocuous, though.

Mr. Del Guercio: I want the record to show that I seriously object to their introduction.

Presiding Inspector: I know, but I think it is best to do it. Mr. Gladstein thinks, and perhaps he is right about it, that this has materiality. I have got to evaluate this testimony, although my decision is not the ultimate one. Others will do it, too.

Mr. Del Guercio: In our offer of documents you will recall that we were restricted strictly to real documents in the introduction of offers.

Presiding Inspector: I remember very well, Mr. Del Guercio, what has happened. I don't remember every word of the testimony.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. Now, Mr. Bridges,—

Mr. Del Guercio (Interposing): We were required to go through the authenticity of every document almost.

Presiding Inspector: Well, I will take that teletype.

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. Did you receive or did your office receive a telegram from Mr. Joseph Curran that the Madison Square Garden meeting had been arranged for?

[5618]

A. Yes.

Q. In the 1936 strike was any special designation or name used by Mr. Curran in any of the communications that he directed to the West Coast?

A. Yes.

Q. What was that designation?

A. "JACY".

Q. When was that chosen?

A. That was chosen as an aftermath of the spring strike. In the spring strike certain forged communications came through that got us into some pretty hot water. Certain employers' agents were sending communications backwards and forwards. They were sending some supposedly signed by me and we were receiving some supposedly signed by Curran. We found out that they originated with the shipping employers. So from that time on as a result of that we learned our lesson and then we had certain code words that followed our various names, as you will



(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

notice running all through these, and unless those code words were on there we disregarded the message and on occasion the code letters were changed.

Q. How was "JACY" pronounced?

A. Just four letters.

Q. I say, how were the four letters pronounced?

A. I don't know. I never tried to pronounce them. [5619] "J.C.", I guess.

Q. What does "JACY" mean?

A. Joe Curran, New York.

Q. I show you a telegram—

Mr. Del Guercio (Interposing): Does the reporter get how it was pronounced? I didn't get the answer.

Presiding Inspector: "J.C.", I suppose.

Mr. Gladstein: It quite obviously stands for the initials.

Mr. Del Guercio: "JACY", I understand the telegram is signed.

Mr. Gladstein: The telegram is signed "JACY" which, when pronounced, is "J.C."; and if you divide that into the two syllables you will observe that they represent the initials of the man's name.

Mr. Del Guercio: Well, never mind.

Mr. Myron: That is Mr. Gladstein's pronunciation and Mr. Bridges doesn't know how to pronounce it.

Mr. Gladstein: I thought I heard Mr. Bridges testify to that.

Presiding Inspector: Well, it is in the record. Go ahead.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. I show you this telegram under date of December 2, [5620] addressed to you and ask you whether that was received by you or your office?

A. It has got a pencil notation on as to when it was received, I think, and it has got the office stamp on it, that it was received on December 2nd. I wasn't in San Francisco at this time. It was teletyped me up north.

Q. And where did you obtain this particular telegram? A. Out of my files.

Mr. Gladstein: I offer it in evidence, your Honor.

Mr. Del Guercio: Your Honor, I object to it. No proper foundation has been laid for its introduction. The witness has testified that he did not receive it, that he was elsewhere at the time of its purported arrival in San Francisco. There is a receipt stamp there, but there is a "By" also and a blank after "By" indicating that there is no evidence as to by whom it was received.

Mr. Gladstein: The authenticity, your Honor, of any of these telegrams or other documents can be checked by the FBI, I am quite sure, because as I understand it, the various telegraph companies keep records of the telegrams that are sent. I may be misinformed.

Presiding Inspector: They wouldn't be open to anyone.

Mr. Del Guercio: You are misinformed and you know better.

Mr. Gladstein: No. I was under the impression that they did. [5621]

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Presiding Inspector: I don't think they keep them as long back as this. I am not sure about that.

Mr. Gladstein: The witness identifies it as a telegram received by his office; he identifies the stamp on it; he says that he obtained it from his files; he says that he has knowledge, personal knowledge of the contents of the telegram by virtue of the fact that it was relayed to him.

Presiding Inspector: I will receive it.

(The document referred to was received in evidence and marked Alien's Exhibit No. 35.)

Mr. Del Guercio: We may want to make a test as to when that receipt was put on.

Mr. Gladstein: You may see it.

Mr. Del Guercio: By \_\_\_\_\_s.

Mr. Gladstein: You may have it for any person you like, Mr. Del Guercio. It hasn't been marked yet. Do you mind allowing the Reporter to mark it for the record?

Mr. Del Guercio: The Reporter will call that to my attention.

Presiding Inspector: Oh, well, now. Let's go ahead.

Mr. Gladstein: May I read it?

Mr. Del Guercio: If your Honor please, I would like to call attention to something else. It is written in pencil here, apparently, "12:10 PM Dec 2".

Mr. Gladstein: I suppose by that Mr. Del Guercio means [5622] to imply that the year isn't shown, but if your Honor will see that stamped on the document itself at the very top there is what appears, as I

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

believe on every telegram that comes through the telegraph offices a year and a date number.

Presiding Inspector: I will take it. I will take it.

Mr. Gladstein: And you find this is "Dec 2 1936" or, I should say "1936 Dec 2 PM 12:02".

I will read this in evidence. It is addressed to Harry Bridges, 112 Market Street.

"ABBCF have arranged for super mass meeting maritime situation stop on December 14th wire at once if you—". At that point there is a parenthesis with the figures "02" in the parenthesis and then the end of the parenthesis, and it is signed "JACY".

Presiding Inspector: The next question, Mr. Gladstein.

Mr. Gladstein: Yes, your Honor. [5623]

(Whereupon Mr. Gladstein handed Mr. Del Guercio a document.)

Mr. Del Guercio: How many of these are there? I suggest that he might as well introduce them en masse.

Presiding Inspector: I suggested that to Mrs. King.

Mr. Del Guercio: We object to the introduction of every one of them on the same ground; that is, no proper foundation has been laid for them.

Mr. Grossman: The Government is still about 200 exhibits ahead of us, your Honor. I don't think we are being unfair.

Mr. Del Guercio: We laid a proper foundation for the introduction of every document.

Mr. Gladstein: Could I ask for the exhibits that

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

the Government introduced on the IWW, the two or three booklets?

Mrs. King: Do you want the numbers?

The Reporter: Yes.

Mrs. King: 252, 253, 257 and 259.

(The exhibits referred to were given to Mr. Gladstein.)

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. I want to go for a moment to the question of these IWW documents. I show you Government's Exhibit No. 252, "The I.W.W., its History, Structure and Methods," by Vincent St. John. While you were in the IWW did you ever see distributed, or did you yourself distribute, any copy of that document?

[5624]

A. Not that I can remember.

Q. Have you ever had one in your possession to your knowledge? A. No.

Q. Did you know, at any time that you were in the IWW, whether or not that document was distributed by the IWW, or its membership?

A. I don't know.

Q. Did you know then?

A. Not that I can remember.

Presiding Inspector: May I see it?

(Government's Exhibit No. 252 was passed to the Presiding Inspector.)

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. I show you Government's Exhibit No. 253 entitled "Sabotage," by Walker C. Smith, and ask you to examine it and state whether, while you

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

were in the IWW, you ever saw it distributed, or whether you yourself ever distributed any copies, of that publication?

A. (Examining pamphlet) The first time I ever seen a pamphlet like this was in this hearing.

Q. You have never had one in your possession?

A. No.

Q. Did you ever know, while you were in the IWW, or just before you joined that organization, whether or not this [5625] pamphlet, or one similar to it, on the subject of "Sabotage" was ever distributed by the IWW or any of its members?

A. Not that I know of.

Q. I show you Government's Exhibit 257 entitled "The Revolutionary I. W. W." by Grover H. Perry, and I will ask you whether, while you were in the IWW, you ever saw that pamphlet, or publication, or anything like it, distributed by the IWW, or any of its members?

A. (Examining pamphlet) No; I have never seen this pamphlet before.

Q. Did you, yourself, ever distribute such a pamphlet? A. No.

Q. Have you ever had one in your possession?

A. Not that I remember.

Q. Did you know, when you joined the IWW, or while you were in it, whether or not such a pamphlet was distributed either officially, or by the membership of the IWW? A. I did not.

Q. I show you Government's Exhibit No. 259 entitled "I. W. W. Songs," and ask you to



(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

state whether, while you were in the IWW, you ever saw copies of that distributed?

A. (Examining pamphlet) I have seen copies of the songbook—I don't know if this is the particular form of the book—but I recall song pamphlets, pamphlets with songs in it, at the time I was a member. Songs that I recognize are in here. [5626] I possessed one at one time.

Q. Can you go through that pamphlet and tell which songs were distributed in pamphlet form by the IWW, or its membership while you were a member?

Mr. Myron: If he knows—as far as he knows.

Presiding Inspector: Of course.

A. (Referring to Government's Exhibit No. 259) I recall very many of these songs, even before I was a member of the IWW. I don't think that there is anything new about the songs by Joe Hill.

I don't think there is anything new about "The Red Flag"—an old Socialist song.

I don't think there is anything new about "The Workers' Marseillaise."

I remember this one about "Scissor Bill."

I think I remember "The Preacher and The Slave," another Joe Hill song.

"Ta-ra-ra-Boom-De-ay"—I remember that one.

I certainly recall "Hold the Fort."

I certainly recall "Solidarity Forever."

"Casey Jones"—I am familiar with.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Q Have you sung it? A: I have sung it.

Presiding Inspector: You mean with these words? Not Casey Jones, but Ta-ra-ra-boom-De-ay? [5627]

The Witness: Tunes adapted from those songs.

Presiding Inspector: But not the words, those in the song book?

The Witness: I specifically recall singing some of them at this time. But I remember them at that time, and I remember this particular "Casey Jones" song. It used to be sung at sea. After all, it is not specifically sung ashore.

Presiding Inspector: That is the "Sea" Casey Jones?

The Witness: Well—

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. Do you know whether various lyrics have been sung to the same tunes of Casey Jones and the other songs in this pamphlet?

A. Yes. There have been additions to them, and some of them, I can say I have heard some of these songs sung the world over. I have heard some of those songs in many parts of the world.

Q. Have you ever sung any of these songs for the purpose of advocating the overthrow of the United States Government by force and violence, or for the purpose of advocating sabotage, or the unlawful destruction of property?

A. No; and I recall nobody else did. They were solidarity songs, morale songs, pep songs, and many times for amusement, of course.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Presiding Inspector: Were they sung satirically? [5628]

The Witness: Generally speaking; yes.

Presiding Inspector: In disregard of what they say?

The Witness: I would say yes. My recollection of the people that sung them at those times, they didn't sing them with the idea of carrying out the intent of the songs.

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. Now, going back to the last exhibit, the telegram, I show you what purports to be a copy of a teletype message and ask you if you can identify it?

A. (Examining document) Yes. This is a teletype from my office in San Francisco to Portland, a copy of a teletype.

Q. Where were you at the time, if you know?

A. I was in—let me see the date—

Mr. Del Guercio: (Interposing) It tells you on the top there.

Presiding Inspector: He is looking for it.

A. (Continuing) On the top it says "Is Bridges still in Portland?"

On December 2, 1936, in the evening at least, I was in Aberdeen, Washington. I know that.

This shows the afternoon, 12:10, P. M. apparently, on December 2. I would still be in Portland, or maybe around there somewhere. I have the records which I can check as to where I was at that time.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

By Mr. Gladstein: [5629]

Q. Where did you obtain the teletype?

A. Out of my files in my San Francisco office. The other end of it is in Portland, I presume, a copy. The original possibly was delivered to me in Portland.

Mr. Gladstein: I offer it, if your Honor please, in evidence.

Mr. Del Guercio: I object to it, your Honor.

Presiding Inspector: Have you seen it?

Mr. Del Guercio: Yes, I have. No proper foundation has been laid for the copy, or what purports to be a copy of the original. This witness does not know whether he received it or not.

(The document referred to was passed to the Presiding Inspector.)

Mr. Del Guercio: I believe that counsel should be required to lay a proper foundation for the introduction of any document.

Presiding Inspector: Did you ever see that teletype before?

The Witness: Undoubtedly, if the teletype was sent, I would receive a copy of it in due course.

The only difference between, when I said the original, the only difference between this and the original is the color of the paper. The paper is the same texture, the wording is the same, except the other paper is white and this is yellow. In fact, both copies are made together on the [5630] machine. I am pretty sure you could come up here with that same thing on white paper and the

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

only difference between the original and the copy would be the color of the paper.

Presiding Inspector: You remember receiving this?

The Witness: Yes. There are reasons for remembering those things.

Presiding Inspector: I will take it.

(The teletype message referred to was thereupon received in evidence and marked Alien's Exhibit No. 36.)

Mr. Del Guercio: There was an objection that no proper foundation has been laid.

Presiding Inspector: I think a foundation was laid with the questions I asked.

Mr. Del Guercio: The original is available.

Presiding Inspector: There is no difference between the original and the copy. There is no signature on these.

Mr. Del Guercio: No signature; no.

Presiding Inspector: One is yellow and the other is white. I don't see that it makes any difference.

Mr. Del Guercio: That could have been made today.

Presiding Inspector: So could the original. He said he has an independent recollection of receiving this.

By Mr. Gladstein:

O. Now, Mr. Bridges, this telegram refers—

I won't put this in the form of a question, but

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

so the [5631] record will show it, your Honor, I point ou that Alien's Exhibit No. 36 in evidence refers to Alien's Exhibit 35, namely, the telegram from Mr. Curran. I call your Honor's attention to this—

Presiding Inspector: Really the same thing?

Mr. Gladstein: Except for one thing, and that I want to call your attention to, and that is in the telegram you will notice the last word is "You". It says "Wire at Once ~~W~~ If You" and then there is a parenthetical reference to the figure "02".

In the teletype your Honor will notice that the quoted telegram reads, although there is a misspelled word, "If You Can Attend"—the words "Can Attend" in the teletype. :

I point out to your Honor that reference.

We can have a Western Union representative testify on this if necessary, though I don't deem it that important, but it is my belief—

Mr. Myron: (Interposing) We don't want his belief in the record.

Mr. Del Guercio: He is not under oath.

Mr. Myron: It speaks for itself, I believe.

Presiding Inspector: Let it speak for itself.

Mr. Gladstein: All right. Let it speak for itself.

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. Now, Mr. Bridges, did you have any problem in going [5632] back to attend the Madison Square Garden meeting? A. Yes.



(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Q. What was the nature of that problem?

A. Getting the proper dates arranged, trying to cover enough meetings on schedule time, and having the dates so spaced that we could get around.

Q. What was your schedule on the Pacific Coast in the latter part of November and the early part of December, with reference to the mass meetings or other meetings?

A. Seattle, November 30; Aberdeen, Washington, December 2; Portland the next day; Astoria that night. I was due back in San Francisco December 5 in the afternoon. Then there was a meeting in San Francisco on December 8th. There was a national radio broadcast on December 7th. There were tentative arrangements that we had to cancel in both Portland and Los Angeles for meetings because we couldn't fit the dates in. All the arrangements were made and had to be cancelled.

Presiding Inspector: What dates?

The Witness: We had one meeting arranged in Portland, or Los Angeles—I think it was Los Angeles—for December 17th; and a meeting around the same time, I think, December 15 or 16 in Portland. We just didn't make the dates jibe. We postponed those meetings to a later date.

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. By virtue of this schedule, or these mass meetings [5633] that you were covering on the Pacific Coast, how did that affect the ultimate announcement of when you could go back east?

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Mr. Del Guercio: I will object to the question in its form.

Presiding Inspector: Isn't that self-evident? He had these engagements and naturally they would affect any arrangements for going east.

[5634]

Mr. Gladstein: Well, let me put it this way:—

Presiding Inspector: (Interposing) He couldn't be in two places.

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. At any stage—at any time up to—withdraw that.

Did you ultimately tell the East that you were going back there to speak?

Mr. Del Guercio: Well, I will object to that, if your Honor please, unless we get something more specific than "the East".

Presiding Inspector: Of course, he did go back East.

Mr. Gladstein: Yes, he did. I wanted to know whether prior to his going back there he communicated with them.

Presiding Inspector: There is no question about it. Before he started he must have told them.

Mr. Gladstein: Yes. I think that is also self-evident.

Presiding Inspector: I think so.

Mr. Gladstein: But nevertheless there is some documentary evidence on it as to the date and so on.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. Prior to your going back to the East Coast to address the Madison Square Garden meeting did you communicate with the East or cause a communication to be sent to the East Coast?

Mr. Del Guercio: I will object to the question unless [5635] something more definite than "the East" is included in the question.

Presiding Inspector: I will take it.

A. I both telephoned and I wrote.

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. To whom?

A. From the Northwest. When I was in the Northwest at that time I telephoned and wrote, both.

Q. To whom?

A. To Curran and to the longshoremen in Boston.

Mr. Del Guercio: Curran and who?

The Witness: Joe Curran and the longshoremen in Boston.

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. When you say "the longshoremen in Boston" to whom do you have reference?

A. The ILA Local in Boston that we were communicating with at that time.

Q. Now, before you actually left the West Coast to speak at the Madison Square Garden meeting had any arrangements been made for any meeting other than the one at the Madison Square Garden?

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

A. Yes. Specifically the meeting in Boston. The only thing was the question of date. I told them to go ahead and arrange a meeting up there, get all the preliminary arrange-[5636] ments; we would notify them as to definite date afterwards. That was the same situation on the West Coast. We made all preliminary arrangements and it was just a question of setting the exact date. There is a lot of work and preparation in a meeting that takes a few days or maybe weeks and all we were trying to get straightened out was definite dates and have them properly spaced so we could take care of them all. And before I left the West Coast I notified the East Coast to arrange meetings in ports other than New York, and in Boston. I had already arranged that from the Northwest before I ever left the Northwest to come back to San Francisco. It was arranged by long-distance phone.

Q. Before leaving for the East, Mr. Bridges, did you cause to be communicated to the East your desire that meetings be arranged in the Ports of New York, Boston, Baltimore and Philadelphia?

A. Yes.

Mr. Del Guercio: Any particular portion of this or all of it?

Mr. Gladstein: Oh, the first page shows it, I think. There is a paragraph there, the first paragraph; the first subparagraph.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. I show you a mimeographed letter of three pages under date of December 10th and ask you whether you can identify it.

A. I can. [5637]

Mr. Del Guercio: Hasn't the witness seen that before?

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. What is the answer?

A. I can. It was one of our official communications that was sent out at that time.

Mr. Gladstein: I offer this in evidence with particular reference, your Honor, to the first page in which the Pacific Coast District Executive Board of the ILA announces that it has decided on the following plan of action—

Mr. Del Guercio: (Interposing) Well, if your Honor please, before counsel reads it let me get in an objection.

Mr. Gladstein: Oh, certainly.

Mr. Del Guercio: I am objecting to the introduction of the document on the same ground as before. It is immaterial and irrelevant. The contents of that letter do not in any wise contradict or affect the evidence already given.

Presiding Inspector: It is a self-serving declaration.

Mr. Gladstein: Well, a little bit different from that.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Presiding Inspector: It is a confirmatory statement made at another time.

Mr. Gladstein: No. I haven't had him testify on this subject. Here on December 10th is an official announcement, your Honor, by the Pacific Coast District Executive Board which says, in effect, that an ILA delegation is being dispatched to the East Coast to cover the Ports of New York, Boston, Baltimore [5638] and Philadelphia and appeal to the longshoremen there to do this, that and the other thing; in other words, clearly referring to mass meetings in those four cities.

Now, your Honor may recall that Mr. Innes testified that the arrangements or the idea of having mass meetings in Boston, Baltimore and Philadelphia were discussed for the first time and laid down in what he called a "fraction meeting" in the Victoria Hotel after Mr. Bridges arrived in New York. I am here trying to show that the itinerary of covering those ports in mass meetings, those four that actually were covered, was all announced and covered officially by the Union on the West Coast before Mr. Bridges ever got to the East Coast. That is the materiality.

Mr. Del Guercio: If your Honor please, —

Presiding Inspector: (Interposing) You can prove that by the testimony of Mr. Bridges.

Mr. Gladstein: Yes.

Presiding Inspector: Let us get Mr. Bridges' testimony and then offer it. Or, if you say you are going to ask him —



(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Mr. Gladstein: Yes, I was going to ask him. It is a matter of order. Can we mark it for identification?

Presiding Inspector: I will allow it to go in evidence.

Mr. Gladstein: All right.

Presiding Inspector: It is violating the usual rules of Common Law. [5639]

(The document referred to was received in evidence and marked Alien's Exhibit No. 37.)

Mr. Del Guercio: May we have the record show that we don't agree with counsel's interpretation of what the witness testified to?

Presiding Inspector: Oh, yes. You are not bound by that. The trier of the facts has to evaluate all the evidence.

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. Now, Mr. Bridges, was the idea of your speaking at mass meetings in cities other than New York on the occasion of your trip back there in December of 1936 originated for the first time in the Victoria Hotel in New York or elsewhere?

A. Elsewhere.

Q. And where was the "elsewhere"?

A. In the Northwest and in San Francisco, because my trip back East was not worth while unless I spoke to the longshoremen of those ports and was not necessary unless I spoke to the longshoremen in those ports, because the trip had a definite reason. There was a deadline laid down

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

as to how long we would give the International to respond to our demands for help, as they had promised us; and before I left all locals were ordered to take up and discuss and vote on the question of East Coast Ports, meaning that if the East Coast longshoremen walked out in support of us we would not settle our West Coast [5640] strike until they were safely protected. And all locals were notified before I left the West Coast to take up and vote on this question and notify me by telegram in New York City, care of Joe Curran. And the letter here refers to that particular thing, and, therefore, it can be seen that unless these meetings were arranged and I definitely went back with them all scheduled out my trip East was worthless.

Mr. Gladstein: Shall we suspend for the day?

Presiding Inspector: No. Go on five minutes longer.

Mr. Gladstein: I beg your pardon?

Presiding Inspector: Go on until a quarter after.

The Witness: I wish to add—

Mr. Del Guercio: (Interposing) Now, there is no question pending.

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. Just a moment! Do you wish to add something to your last answer?

A. I just thought of this much: That I have the sheaf of telegrams that were sent to New York

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

while I was there all concurring in the action of the Executive Board and my going East, and all saying that they would support the East Coast longshoremen if the East Coast longshoremen moved in our support.

Q. From whom were these telegrams?

Mr. Del Guercio: Just a minute! I want to make a motion to strike the last answer. I move to strike the last answer [5641] as not being responsive to the question and it was not in explanation of anything.

Presiding Inspector: Well, giving it a broad interpretation, I think it was explanatory. Of course, if the objection went to the *telegrams* would speak for themselves, that would be different.

You don't expect to produce them, do you?

Mr. Gladstein: *There* a lot of them and I don't know that it is necessary to encumber the record with them, your Honor.

Presiding Inspector: I will let it stand.

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. From whom were these telegrams?

Presiding Inspector: He said from all the Unions on the West Coast.

Mr. Gladstein: Oh, I beg your pardon.

Presiding Inspector: Now, Mr. Bridges, had you planned for all of the meetings at which you spoke? That is, had you told them tentatively to arrange for them?

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

The Witness: Yes.

Presiding Inspector: But, of course, you didn't know the dates absolutely?

The Witness: I knew the dates.

Presiding Inspector: In all cases? [5642]

The Witness: The date for the meeting in Boston, I arranged that meeting by a long-distance telephone from some place in the Northwest. The date for Philadelphia was arranged. The date for New York—

Presiding Inspector: (Interposing) Was arranged from the West or from New York?

The Witness: From here, from this end.

The date for New York was arranged, although it was changed; and the date for Baltimore was arranged.

Presiding Inspector: It was all arranged before you left?

The Witness: Before I ever left San Francisco.

Presiding Inspector: Including the dates?

The Witness: Yes. And I wired. I am sure—well, I did wire New York along those lines following up the conversations that I had over the phone.

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. When you got to New York, Mr. Bridges—withdraw that.

Who accompanied you to New York?

A. In my immediate company Randolph Meriweather, who was the Business Manager of the

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Marine Engineers' Beneficial Association; also going Captain George Charlot of the Masters, Mates & Pilots Association, Local 90, San Francisco.

[5643]

Q. Were either of those Unions involved in the strike? A. All of them; both of them were.

Q. What was the purpose of their trip East?

A. Because their National Unions were attempting at that time or had indicated they were going to call off the strike of those particular unions on the East Coast.

Q. Now, with whom—withdraw that.

Do you know how—did you call him "Captain" Charlot? A. Captain Charlot; C-h-a-r-l-o-t.

Q. Do you know how he went?

A. I am not sure whether he took a train or went by plane.

Q. You and Mr. Meriweather went together?

A. Both by plane.

Q. When you arrived in New York were you met? A. At the airport, yes.

Q. By whom?

A. I only remember Joe Curran.

Q. Were there others?

A. I think there were.

Q. Where did you go?

A. To the Victoria Hotel.

Q. What happened there?

A. My recollection is that Meriweather registered for the room. I don't recall registering. We took a double room in the hotel and I'm fairly

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

sure that I didn't sign the register. [5644] Meriweather signed for both of us.

Q. Now, in that hotel after your arrival did any meeting take place in which you, Roy Hudson, Tommy Raye, Al Lannon, Joe Curran, Peter Innes, possibly Mervyn Rathborne, were present?

Q. A. No, definitely not. Mervyn Rathborne was in San Francisco. [5645]

Q. Was Mr. Hudson in the room? A. No.

Q. Was Tom Raye in the room? A. No.

Q. Was Mr. Lannon in the room?

A. No.

Q. Was Curran there?

A. No—yes, he was there.

Q. Was Mr. Innes there?

A. I am not sure about Mr. Innes. My recollection is that he was not.

Q. What took place in your room after you arrived, if anything?

A. We discussed things for a few moments. We were pretty tired. The plane got in early, or the middle of the afternoon. Meriweather and I were pretty tired. As I recall it we slept for a little while. I had a meeting scheduled that night. I think—not to Boston, but to Philadelphia, my recollection is.

Q. At any time on that trip—

Presiding Inspector: Do you know those men whose names were mentioned?

The Witness: I know them—I know Al Lannon, and Tommy Raye. I met them for the first



(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

time about six months afterwards. I know Hudson. I met Hudson—he was in San Fran- [5646] cisco at that time, during the 1936 strike. I met him for the first time at that time. He was in San Francisco at that time.

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. When did you meet Tommy Raye for the first time? A. June, 1937.

Q. Do you remember under what circumstances?

A. Yes.

Q. What were they?

A. He was at that time, the first time I met Raye, he was the Chairman, or Secretary of the New York Maritime Council. I am sure that wasn't formed until the spring of 1937.

Q. And in what connection did you meet him, under what circumstances?

A. I met him in New York Headquarters of the National Maritime Union.

Presiding Inspector: I think we will stop here until tomorrow morning.

(Whereupon, at 4:15 o'clock p. m. an adjournment was taken until Thursday, May 29, 1941, at 10:00 o'clock a. m.) [5647]

Court Room 276,  
Federal Building,  
San Francisco, California,  
May 29, 1941.

Met, pursuant to adjournment, at 10:00 A. M.

[5648]

PROCEEDINGS

Presiding Inspector: You may proceed, Mr. Gladstein.

HARRY RENTON BRIDGES

called as a witness in his own behalf, having been previously duly sworn, testified further as follows:

Direct Examination (Resumed)

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. Mr. Bridges, you remember the witness, Thompson, who testified in this case?

A. Yes.

Q. To your knowledge have you ever seen him before until the time he came in here?

A. No.

Q. During the period from October 1934 to and including the end of April, or the first part of May, 1935, at any time during that period were you in New York City? A. No.

Q. What was the extent of your departure from the west coast, or from San Francisco, during that period?

A. I never left the Pacific Coast states. Yesterday I said, if I recall, and it was slightly in error, that our records showed I hadn't left San

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Francisco. I referred at that time to my records in my office in San Francisco which indicated that I had not left the Pacific Coast States for a period longer than—I hadn't left them—and I can produce records to show— [5649]

Presiding Inspector: We are taking your recollection.

The Witness: There was a slight error in the testimony yesterday.

Presiding Inspector: You can make a correction.

The Witness: I didn't exactly mean San Francisco; I meant any Pacific Coast, West Coast states.

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. Now, Mr. Bridges, at any time have you ever been a member of the Marine Workers Industrial Union? A. At no time.

Q. Have you ever been affiliated with that organization?

Mr. Del Guercio: Well, your Honor, I object to the question unless the witness—

Presiding Inspector: I think that is a question for the Court.

Mr. Gladstein: All right.

Presiding Inspector: He may tell what relation he has had with them, if any.

Mr. Gladstein: He has already testified to that.

Presiding Inspector: Although, if there is anything more he may tell it.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. Did you ever have any correspondence with William McCuiston? [5650]

A. Not that I can recall. I have written to a lot of people and it is possible that I might have received or written a letter in the course of Union business, but not that I can ever remember.

Q. Did you ever correspond with him on the subject of Communist Party policies or the Communist Party, or the Marine Workers Industrial Union? A. At no time.

Q. Did you ever submit to Mr. McCuiston or to any body else while you were connected with the Waterfront Worker copies of that paper for editing back east? A. At no time.

Q. Was it submitted to anyone back east for auditing—or, editing, I should say?

A. No. It was submitted to no one except the longshoremen involved.

Mr. Del Guercio: Except to who?

The Witness: Except the longshoremen involved, and I wouldn't say "submitted" to them either. Articles went in as they came in without any editing or change whatsoever.

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. Now, at my request did you attempt to find the telegram which is referred to in a teletype message that yesterday was admitted in evidence with respect to a problem involving Peter Innes in 1936? [5651] A. Yes.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Q. Did you find such a telegram?

A. I did.

(The telegram referred to was passed to Mr. Del Guercio.)

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. I show you a telegram under date of November 20, 1936, and ask you if that is the telegram to which you have just referred? A. It is.

Mr. Gladstein: I offer it in evidence.

Mr. Del Guercio: We object to its admission in evidence, if your Honor please; not material to any of the issues in this case. It doesn't explain or contradict anything.

Presiding Inspector: I will take it over your objection.

Mr. Del Guercio: And no proper foundation laid for it. The telegram, if the Court will note, is addressed to the Joint Strike Committee...

Presiding Inspector: He was Chairman at that time.

Mr. Del Guercio: We don't know.

Presiding Inspector: He has sworn to it.

Mr. Del Guercio: It is addressed to the Joint Strike Committee.

The Witness: I was Chairman the day that telegram was received and read into the record, and I have the minutes.

Mr. Del Guercio: Was there a question on it?

[5652]

Presiding Inspector: Yes. That was implied

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

from my remarks. I understand that he had already sworn to it. I will let it stand.

(The document referred to was received in evidence and marked Alien's Exhibit No. 38.)

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. Mr. Bridges, have you made a search of the minutes of the San Francisco Bay Area District Council No. 2 acting as the San Francisco Joint Marine Strike Committee during the 1936 Strike to determine whether the telegram which has just been received in evidence, Alien's 38, appears as part of the official minutes of any meeting of that group? A. I have.

Presiding Inspector: This doesn't add anything, does it?

Mr. Gladstein: It does not, except that it appears officially because—the only point I had was that if there is any question as to the authenticity of the telegram the minutes of that date, November 21, 1936, record the receipt of a telegram from J. Curran setting forth verbatim the text of the telegram that has just been received in evidence.

Presiding Inspector: Very well.

Mr. Gladstein: Perhaps at this time it is immaterial, and if cross examination does not raise any further question—

Presiding Inspector (Interposing): I should think so, Mr. Gladstein. [5653]

Mr. Gladstein: All right.



(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. Now, do you know when Peter Innes for the first time received any kind of credentials authorizing him to represent the East Coast seamen to or on the West Coast Strike Committee?

A. During the strike of 1936, after it broke out.

Q. Do you know what the form of those credentials was?

A. He received them by telegram. We refused to seat him, or recognize him, on the Strike Committee, because of the trouble we had, unless we had further credentials—on account of the trouble we had. Therefore, we demanded credentials before he would be recognized and seated on the Committee. He was wired credentials from back East. He had no credentials.

(Mr. Gladstein passed a telegram to Mr. Del Guercio.)

Mr. Del Guercio: If the Court please, I have been shown by counsel a telegram addressed to Peter Innes by Joe Curran. That telegram, I don't believe, was produced at the time Peter Innes was on the stand, although apparently available.

Presiding Inspector: I don't think it was, but I don't know as that is material.

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. You just testified that Mr. Innes received telegraphic authorization to represent the East Coast strikers at the time, or immediately after

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

the West Coast strike went into effect, is that correct? A. That is right. [5654]

Q. Do you know whether—withdraw that. Do you know what, if anything, Mr. Innes did with that telegram when it was received by him?

A. He presented it to the Strike Committee as credentials, and it was received as a regular credential. He was ordered seated by a vote of the Committee on that occasion.

Q. Were others who were seated in the Strike Committee also required to present credentials from their unions?

A. They all were required to present official credentials.

Q. I show you a telegram, dated October 29, 1936, purporting to be from Joe Curran to Peter Innes, and I will ask you whether that was the telegram which was presented by Mr. Innes as his credentials to entitle him to sit as an East Coast representative with the West Coast Strike Committee?

A. (Examining telegram): It is. Ordinarily we wouldn't accept a telegram, but inasmuch as it has the code on it we knew it was authentic and we accepted the telegram and seated him under those credentials.

Mr. Gladstein: I offer it in evidence.

Mr. Del Guercio: I will object to it.

Presiding Inspector: I will receive it over the objection.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

(The telegram referred to was received in evidence and marked Alien's Exhibit No. 39.)

By Mr. Gladstein: )

Q. Will you state whether, prior to October 29; the date [5655] of the last exhibit, Alien's 39, there was ever shown to you, or ever came to your attention or knowledge, any other credentials of any character by Mr. Innes?

A. Nothing, except his union book or strike card from the 1936 strike. That was all he had.

Q. Now, Mr. Bridges, at the Madison Square Garden meeting you spoke, did you?

A. I did.

Q. Did you have any meetings, either before or after that mass meeting, in which any of the following persons were present: David Leeds?

A. Never met him in my life.

Q. Tom Raye? A. No.

Q. Roy Hudson? A. No.

Q. What, if anything, did you do after the mass meeting was over?

A. As soon as I stepped off the platform there was an old friend of mine that I had sailed with in Australia, and in the islands, and he was standing at the foot of the stairs. I recognized him immediately. He came along with me. We went back, and I spoke to the newspaper reporters for a while, and then we left, and we went to some place where we spent three or four hours having some drinks, and talking about [5656] our old times together. His

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

name is George Maynard—M-a-y-n-a-r-d. He came from Rhode Island. He was formerly a shipmate of mine and he came up with me from Australia on the Ysabel. That was the first time I had seen him since that time. That is all we done until about four o'clock in the morning. The meeting didn't get through until around 12:30 at night. It was around 4:00 in the morning when he went home. I invited him to come to the hotel and see me the next day. I don't recall whether he did or not.

[5657]

Q. Now, Mr. Bridges, at any time prior to that meeting at the Madison Square Garden in December of 1936 did you speak on the long distance telephone between San Francisco and New York with Thomas Raye?

A. No.

Q. Did you speak with anyone on the long distance telephone and receive orders from the Communist Party to appear at that Madison Square Garden meeting?

A. No.

Q. Do you recall the testimony of Mr. Innes that while he was in your office or in the office that was shared by you and Mr. Rathborne a telephone call came in, as a result of which he said he and you went downstairs to a public phone and made a telephone connection with New York City? Did any such incident occur?

A. Not at all. The idea was ridiculous.

Mr. Del Guercio: I move that the last part of the answer be stricken.

Presiding Inspector: Strike it out.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. Before you went East—withdraw that.

Presiding Inspector: Not the part that no such thing occurred.

Mr. Del Guercio: No, just the last part.

By Mr. Gladstein: [5658].

Q. Can you recall what the indication was to you to attend the Madison Square Garden meeting with respect to the payment of your traveling expenses?

A. East Coast—the East Coast Seamen's Committee said that they would pay the expenses.

Q. Did they arrange for your airplane passage?

A. My airplane ticket was arranged for in New York City; a round trip ticket.

Q. Did you receive any of your other expenses or any expenses at all in New York when you got to the meeting?

A. They drove me to Philadelphia; they furnished the plane ticket to Boston; I paid my own train fare, I think, to Baltimore, and then from Baltimore I went to Washington and came back.

Q. Was that the extent of the expenses which the East Coast discharged in connection with your trip?

A. They paid most of the expenses of the trip; that is, at that time.

Q. Did they pay you any sum of four or five hundred dollars?

A. That is not so. They just paid the expenses

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

and—well, the way it happened was this: When the invitation was made and the offer to pay all expenses was made our Strike Committee on the West Coast, we didn't exactly know their financial condition there and, of course, our Strike Committee said "Well, [5659] as long as they are offering to pay it, why, we'll turn nothing down". And I went back under those conditions.

After I went back there and seen the financial situation, as soon as I returned to the West Coast I got into action and seen that there was a thousand dollars sent back to them immediately. They needed it much more than we did and much more than paying my expenses.

Q. At any time while you were back East on December 14th, 15th or 16th, 1936 or in that vicinity was any sum of cash given to you by any person from the East Coast Seamen's Committee or anyone representing them or anyone having anything to do with the strike?

A. I never received a nickel in actual cash.

Q. Or any other person?

A. Or any person.

Q. Did you ask for any money from them?

A. I did not. I had enough money in so far as expenses were concerned. I was getting a salary at that time, but my salary was turned in weekly to the Strike Committee and I didn't need to take any money from them if I didn't want it, and I didn't need it. As far as any nominal expenses was concerned, my own Union had money.



(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Mr. Myron: Now, is this responsive?

Presiding Inspector: No, I don't think it is.

Mr. Gladstein: I think it is, and I think—

Presiding Inspector (Interposing): No. [5660]

Mr. Gladstein (Continuing): —I think it would be much better—

Presiding Inspector (Interposing): No. I think there is a good deal in there that wasn't material.

Mr. Gladstein: I think it would be much better procedure to allow the witness to answer the question, and if there are parts which counsel feel are not responsive they can always move to strike rather than break in the middle of the answer, because there may be something which is about to be said which is responsive.

Presiding Inspector: He has fully answered the question.

Mr. Del Guercio: The witness is intelligent enough to answer the questions asked.

Presiding Inspector: He has fully answered the question and a good deal more. I don't mean that it isn't natural to say what he did, if it is true.

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. Were you ever advised by any person at all that it was a Communist Party decision for you to speak at the Madison Square Garden meeting on December 16, 1936?

A. I wasn't advised. I knew it wasn't.

Q. I want to refer for a moment—I think in a general way you have covered this subject matter.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Do you recall the testimony of Mr. Cuistion to the effect that in the spring of 1935 you arranged for Mr. McCuistion to be shipped out, although Mr. McCuistion did not hold a Union card in the Sailor's Union [5661] of the Pacific?

Mr. Del Guercio: Before the question is answered, your Honor, I object to counsel making a statement. He was warned yesterday about doing the same thing and it is very objectionable to call attention to previous testimony.

Presiding Inspector: I suppose he knows what happened in that respect.

Mr. Gladstein: He has already testified that the first time he met McCuistion was in 1936 at the Madison Square Garden meeting, but I want specific reference to this particular incident.

Presiding Inspector: It doesn't make any difference about who testified or anything of that kind. Ask him the question.

Mr. Gladstein: All right.

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. Did you, Mr. Bridges, make any arrangements of any kind at all for Mr. McCuistion in the spring of 1935 or the early part of 1935 to be shipped out from San Francisco? A. No.

Q. Mr. Bridges, did you ever attend any top fraction meetings of the Communist Party with a man named Nathaniel Honig or Nat Honig or Nat Davis?

A. No. I never met him until he come into the Court room. [5662]

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Q. Did you ever receive orders at any meeting during the 1936-7 strike to take the ILA—that is, the International Longshoremen's Association Unions—into the CIO?

A. Never received orders to do that at any time.

Q. What in fact was your position on the question of whether the ILA should affiliate with the CIO as of the period during the 1936-7 strike and for several weeks thereafter?

A. I was opposed to it.

Mr. Del Guercio: Just a minute. I object to the question, if your Honor please. "What in fact". He is asking for the witness' testimony.

Presiding Inspector: That's what he is asking for.

Mr. Gladstein: Yes.

Presiding Inspector: I don't understand the objection.

Mr. Del Guercio: Well, that indicates that there might be some contradictory testimony as to what his position was.

Presiding Inspector: Oh, I think that is a mere form of speech. I will take the answer.

A. (Continuing): I was opposed to affiliation.

[5663]

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. What was your position on the question of the CIO during the period beginning, let us say, with the 1936-'37 strike, that is October 28, 1936 to and including the time of the ILA convention in the year 1937?

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

A. To stay in the AF of L, and still support the CIO.

Q. In what way could you support the CIO and still insist that the ILA stay in the AF of L?

A. At that time the CIO had been ordered suspended, the CIO unions. It was merely a committee. It wasn't an organization as yet. It was a committee of organizations that decided to follow a program of organizing workers on the industrial union basis. They had been suspended illegally by the American Federation of Labor. Those unions that were CIO, or comprised the CIO at that time, they still claimed that they were still affiliated to the AF of L and were fighting for reinstatement on the basis that they had been illegally suspended. Our position was to remain, the large body of the CIO, and to fight for the proper reinstatement of those unions and for the adoption of the entire CIO program by the American Federation of Labor. We were strongly advocating and opposing any move toward affiliation with the CIO and the breaking off with our American Federation of Labor affiliate. At the same time we were supporting the program of the CIO in so far as their organizational program was concerned; and [5664] that was simply a program to organize on an industrial union basis.

Q. With specific reference to whether the ILA should be taken into the CIO, when is the first time that you took the position that the ILA should so affiliate?

A. June, 1937.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Q. Did you make your position, prior to June 1937, to the effect that you were opposed to the ILA affiliating with the CIO, known publicly?

A. Yes.

Q. Where and under what circumstances?

A. There was many talks before my own union meetings, many similar talks before union gatherings and conventions. I had done it while I was still a Vice President of the American Federation of Labor in the State of California, and in our convention, and in our various union publications.

Q. When was the ILA convention held in 1937?

A. May 1937.

Q. And at that convention did you publicly, before the convention, state your position on whether the ILA should go into the CIO?

A. I did.

Q. And what was your statement in substance?

Mr. Del Guercio: Your Honor, I object to that as immaterial and irrelevant. [5665].

Presiding Inspector: How is that pertinent? How is it any better than his statement now?

Mr. Gladstein: I will withdraw that question.

Presiding Inspector: It may come out on cross examination.

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. Do you know, Mr. Bridges, whether the Voice of the Federation has ever carried statements of your position in the early part of 1937 on whether the ILA should affiliate with the CIO, or seek such an affiliation?



(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Mr. Del Guercio: I will object to that, your Honor.

Presiding Inspector: I think we should leave that to Mr. Del Guercio's cross examination. I don't think it is any better than his statement, that is, at this time.

Mr. Gladstein: All right.

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. Will you fix the date when the 1936-'37 strike ended?

A. I am not sure but I think it was February 4, 1937. I might be mistaken on that date. It might be March 4; either March or February 4th.

Presiding Inspector: Of course, you can show him the document to refresh his recollection when his recollection is not complete.

Mr. Gladstein: All right.

Presiding Inspector: That is, on a thing of that kind.

(Whereupon Mr. Gladstein passed to Mr. Del Guercio a file [5666] of the Voice of Federation.)

Presiding Inspector: He says he isn't sure as to the date.

The Witness: I am sure it was February 4, your Honor.

Presiding Inspector: He said he is sure it is February 4.

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. The date of the end of the strike?



(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

A. Yes.

Mr. Gladstein: I am now showing counsel something else.

Mr. Del Guercio: The article that counsel has shown me has to do with a matter the Court has already ruled on regarding the witness' stand on the CIO.

Presiding Inspector: He hasn't asked a question about it.

Mr. Gladstein: I will withhold it. It is simply my position that as of the time, you see, in 1937, when the—when Mr. Bridges took the—

Presiding Inspector: I don't think it adds anything at this time.

Mr. Gladstein: All right, your Honor.

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. Now, Mr. Bridges, as of the period of the 1936-'37 strike I want you to tell me what union positions, if any, were held by the following persons, if you know: Henry Schmidt? [5667]

A. President of the San Francisco Longshore Local.

Q. Bjorn Halling?

The Reporter: Spell it, please.

Mrs. King: B-j-o-r-n.

Mr. Gladstein: Halling, H-a-l-l-i-n-g.

A. Halling was a member of the Executive Committee of the local, and he was also Chairman of some SubStrike Committee, as well as a member of the Joint Strike Committee.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. Did he have any connection with publicity?

A. Possibly that is the committee that he was Chairman of; I am not sure.

Presiding Inspector: What local?

The Witness: Of the San Francisco Longshore Local.

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. Revels Cayton?

A. He was a member of the Marine Cooks and Stewards' Association Strike Committee in San Francisco; and also on the Coast Committee.

What makes it so complicated is that there were three committees: Your own local union strike Committee and the San Francisco area Joint Strike Committee and the Coast Joint Strike Committee.

Q. Louis Goldblatt?

A. He was Vice President of the ILA Warehousemen's Union [5668] at that time, San Francisco.

Q. Roy Pyle?

A. Pyle was an official of the American Radio Telegraphists Association, San Francisco.

Q. Mervyn Rathborne?

A. He was Secretary of the San Francisco Council of the Maritime Federation, and Secretary of the Strike Committee.

Q. Z. R. Brown?

A. I think he was Secretary of the San Francisco Local of the Radio Telegraphists.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Q. Matt Meehan?

A. He was the Pacific Coast District Secretary of the ILA.

Q. Al Quittendon?

The Reporter: Spell it, please.

Mr. Gladstein: Q-u-i-t-t-e-n-d-o-n, I think it is.

A. The Assistant Secretary of the Sailors Union of the Pacific.

Q. John Schomaker?

A. I think he was Chairman of the Publicity Committee, of the Joint Strike Publicity Committee, part of the Joint Strike Committee.

Q. When did the longshoremen actually begin to take a vote on whether or not they should become affiliated with the CIO? [5669]

A. June, 1937.

Q. Did that vote have anything to do with any convention that was being held at that time or just prior to that time?

Mr. Del Guercio: I object to the question as leading and suggestive.

Presiding Inspector: I will take it.

A. It was during the 1937 convention of the Maritime Federation of the Pacific. [5670]

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. Where and when was it held?

A. Portland, Oregon, beginning the first week in June, I believe; June 3rd, 4th or 5th; something like that.

Q. What was the result of the vote as far as the longshoremen were concerned?

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

A. Overwhelming majority to affiliate with the CIO, except a few disrupters and such people as that.

Q. When did the affiliation actually become complete?

A. August, 1937; August, the 9th, I think we were chartered.

Q. Now, you have testified that you held a position known as West Coast CIO Director.

When did you achieve that position?

A. The middle of July, 1937.

Q. In what manner?

A. Appointed by the President or the Chairman at that time of CIO, later on approved by the Executive Committee or the Conference—the first conference that the CIO held, which was in October, 1937 in Atlantic City.

Q. Who was the then Chairman by whom your appointment was made?

A. John L. Lewis.

Q. Did you—withdraw that. What general instructions did you receive from the CIO after your appointment as West Coast Director? [5671]

Mr. Del Guercio: I will object to that as being immaterial.

Presiding Inspector: I don't think I grasped the question. Will you read the question.

(The question referred was read by the reporter as above recorded.)

Mr. Gladstein: I will withdraw the question, your Honor.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. What instructions, if any, did you receive from the CIO at your appointment as West Coast CIO Director with respect to the affiliation of A. F. of L. Unions, Local Unions or International Unions, with the CIO?

Mr. Del Guercio: I will object to that, your Honor, as not being material.

Presiding Inspector: Perhaps the witness understands the question. I don't understand it. "What instructions"? You mean what legal advice or——

Mr. Gladstein: (Interposing) No; what instructions he received, if any.

Presiding Inspector: How is that material?

Mr. Gladstein: This is as to the question of how and under what circumstances or conditions the CIO would advocate or would permit the affiliation with it——

Presiding Inspector: (Interposing) How is that [5672] material?

Mr. Gladstein: (Continuing). ——of A. F. of L. Unions. This goes, your Honor, in a preliminary way to the meeting concerning which Mr. Chase testified. I am coming to that, you see.

Mr. Del Guercio: I don't think it is material, if your Honor please.

Mr. Gladstein: Well, I can go at it this way. I will withdraw that question.



(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. Mr. Bridges, do you recall whether or not you spoke at any meetings on West Washington Boulevard in Los Angeles in the fall of 1937?

A. I did.

Q. Do you recall a meeting at which there was, among others, a man by the name of John Horn?

A. I do.

Q. When approximately was that meeting held?

A. August or September, 1937. My best recollection is that it was early in September.

Q. Do you know how that meeting was called?

A. I called it through the Southern California Regional Director at that time, J. R. Robertson.

Presiding Inspector: CIO Director?

A. (Continuing): He was—that's right. He was a CIO Director of Southern California, and the meeting was called [5673] through him. He put out the publicity.

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. What was the purpose of having this meeting called?

A. To convey—I had just returned from Washington and I called a series of meetings on the Pacific Coast to report on the discussions I had with the National officers of the CIO at that time and convey them to the officials locally.

Q. At the meeting, the particular meeting that was attended by Mr. Horn, did you discuss the question of A. F. of L. Unions affiliating with the CIO?

A. I did.



(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Q. What did you say?

Mr. Del Guercio: If your Honor please, I object to that as not being material.

Presiding Inspector: I will take it.

Mr. Del Guercio: What?

Presiding Inspector: I will take it. We have had some evidence in a way as to the character of Mr. Bridges' speech.

Mr. Del Guercio: Then we should have the whole speech and not just a portion of it.

Presiding Inspector: That is what he is going to ask him, what did he say. That calls for the speech.

Mr. Del Guercio: Just the one particular part as to the affiliation with the A. F. of L.?

Presiding Inspector: No. We are going to get the rest. Perhaps he has the manuscript. [5674]

Mr. Gladstein: I will ask him.

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. Do you have the verbatim report of what you said?

A. No. I have looked for it, but I can't find it.

Q. Do you have a recollection of what you said?

A. Fairly good one.

Q. All right. Will you state what you did say?

A. At that time there was quite a lot of misunderstanding not only in Los Angeles but elsewhere as to—

Mr. Myron: (Interposing) Is that what he said?

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Mr. Del Guercio: I will object to that as not answering the question.

Presiding Inspector: Never mind the preliminary. Just tell us what you said.

A. (Continuing) I said that, too, your Honor, because that is the way I opened up by saying that there is quite a little bit of misunderstanding down here as to what the role of the CIO is in swinging over Unions to it. And that's exactly what I said. That is what the meeting was about.

Presiding Inspector: You are entitled to say that.

Mr. Myron: We have no objections if that is what he said.

The Witness: That is what I said and then I followed it up by explaining why the misunderstanding and what the program should be, and that the program was correct because I had discussed this particular matter with the National officers of [5675] the CIO, and we worked out a complete understanding on the whole thing.

I pointed out that the basic program of the CIO was to affiliate to the actual CIO Committee Unions on a national scale, generally speaking. There were certain fields that should not be penetrated or molested in so far as organizing was concerned; that the main concentration should be on the unorganized fields, of which there was certainly plenty in Los Angeles, without moving in or fooling around with the Unions regardless of affiliation that were already in the field.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

I warned against what was going on at that time, and that was that in many cases small groups of individuals that collected a small group or a following in a Local Union would seek a CIO charter for that small group, even though it might be less than a majority of a small Local Union, and in that way there was quite a bit of disruption and destruction going on in the trade union movement in Los Angeles. There was charters being issued that it took us six months to even find some of them. And this was the address that I made there.

I went on to say that they should disregard the campaign and the slander and the publicity that was going on in Los Angeles at that time through the press, through the various employer associations and, of course, coming from all the oppositionists to CIO in the Local A. F. of L. Unions and, in some cases, CIO Unions to the effect that the CIO was a Communist organization; that it was inspired from Moscow; that [5676] John J. Lewis was a Communist, as he was roundly and nationally being called at that time, John Brophy, many of the leaders of the CIO. And, of course, I didn't escape myself and many of the officials of the National Government. And I went into that and told them the purpose of such a thing was to confuse the issue and that they should not only disregard the statements such people made but treat them with suspicion and distrust. And then we laid out the program for further meetings where the whole thing could be gone at in an organized way with no more charters to be granted in the Southern California

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

area unless the situation was thoroughly investigated as to where the charter was going, whom it was going to, and what purpose it was going to be used for. And we also made arrangements to collect a few charters.

Mr. Myron: May I interrupt at this time? He is mentioning "we". I suppose he means himself.

The Witness: All right. We will say me. I was the boss at that time as far as the question of charter was concerned. Charters couldn't be issued without my authority and approval. So in this case we can say "I".

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. Mr. Bridges, at that meeting—

Mr. Del Guercio: (Interposing) Wait a minute! He hasn't finished the speech yet, have you?

The Witness: Just about. Simply by winding up, we [5677] laid plans for more meetings of the same type and meetings of the same type were held regularly, every week or two.

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. At that meeting or at any meeting did you lay down or intend to lay down any policy to govern the conduct of Communist Party members on the question of CIO affiliation?

Mr. Del Guercio: I will object to that, if your Honor please, to the form of "did you intend to". The speech speaks for itself, those who heard him, as to whether it did lay down the Communist Party line.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Presiding Inspector: You mean as separated from other members?

Mr. Gladstein: Yes, yes.

The Witness: The line we laid down was to govern all members of the CIO——

Presiding Inspector: (Interposing) I will take it.

A. (Continuing) —— regardless of affiliation:

By Mr. Gladstein: . .

Q. Were the remarks that you made at that meeting in any way ordered or suggested by the Communist Party or any of its representatives?

A. It came straight from John J. Lewis and John Brophy. Now, I have no definite knowledge as to—I have only heard some testimony around here.

Mr. Del Guercio: Now, just a minute! Is that your complete answer, "only heard some testimony"? [5678]

The Witness: Well, the only knowledge I have got of John L. Lewis being a Communist is the testimony that I hear.

Mr. Del Guercio: Brophy?

The Witness: Brophy; John Brophy?

Mr. Del Guercio: Yes.

The Witness: Yes. I have heard that, too, but I don't believe it.

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. To your knowledge did the Communist Party or its members make any arrangements or have



(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

anything to do with the arrangements that were made for the holding of this particular meeting or any of the other meetings that were held in Los Angeles on this organizational question?

A. No. The notice of the meeting was published in the press.

Q. As coming from whom?

A. Coming from the Southern California CIO Office.

Presiding Inspector: Was it an open meeting?

The Witness: No. It wasn't exactly an open meeting. It was a meeting confined to CIO and A. F. of L. Unions. It wasn't completely a CIO Union meeting. A. F. of L. Unions were also there.

Presiding Inspector: Trade unionist meeting?

The Witness: It was closed to anybody but the trade unionists, yes.

Presiding Inspector: Admitted on cards of the Union, I [5679] suppose, or perhaps by people who knew them? There must have been some kind of recognition.

The Witness: I don't exactly recall that. The actual mechanics of the meeting was not in my hands. The Regional Director down there handled all that.

By Mr. Gladstein:

Q. Did you ever have any private conversation or personal conversation or private meeting with Mr. Ezra Chase? A. Yes, I have.

Q. When?



(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

A. I can't recall; around that time or prior to that time. I have had conversations with him and I have had communications with him, letters.

Q. On what subject matter?

A. About going into the CIO.

Q. Anything else?

A. I think, yes, also on the question of negotiations down there at one time, the various negotiations and contracts and certain difficulties that they were in.

Q. Was Communism or the Communist Party or Communist Party policies discussed in any of these conversations or in any of this correspondence? A. No.

Q. Do you know whether or not Ezra Chase was a Communist?

A. I did not. I didn't even know he was a labor spy. [5680]

Mr. Del Guercio: Well, I move that that last answer be stricken, your Honor.

Presiding Inspector: Strike it out.

Mr. Gladstein: You can cross examine.

Presiding Inspector: The witness is yours, Mr. Del Guercio.

#### Cross Examination

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. Now, Mr. Bridges, don't you attribute your success as a great labor leader even in a small way to the support given to you by the Communist Party?

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

A. Oh, I think I might attribute it more to the attacks made on me by the Hearst press.

Q. But you have received support from the Communist Party and members of the Communist Party, have you not?

A. I wouldn't doubt that that's correct. I have received support from other parties.

Q. And you have supported the Communist Party and Communist Party leaders, have you not, throughout your so-called career?

A. Yes and no.

Q. Now what do you mean "yes or no"?

A. I have supported certain things regardless of what political party might have also supported them, and I have supported individuals and certain policies of all political parties, [5681] Democratic—

Q. (Interposing). Let us confine ourselves to the Communist Party. We are not concerned with the Republican Party and we are not concerned with the Democratic Party or any other party excepting the Communist Party.

A. So long as it is—

Q. (Interposing). When did you support the Communist Party?

A. I don't know. You would have to be specific and you would have to nail it down.

Q. Now, you have made the statement that you have supported the Communist Party. Now tell us, tell the Court here when and under what circumstances you supported the Communist Party.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

A. I was asked a general question. I gave you a general answer. If you will be specific and nail it down to any specific question I will give you a yes-or-no answer.

Q. You mean you refuse to answer the question as to when and under what circumstances you supported the Communist Party?

A. No. I am unable to answer the question in the form it is put.

Q. Now, when and under what circumstances did you support members and leaders of the Communist Party?

A. I can't say off-hand, I haven't stated that I have supported members and leaders of the Communist Party. [5682]

Q. Now, your testimony here has been that you did support leaders of the Communist Party.

A. I don't think that was my testimony.

Q. Now, you left Australia when?

A. You mean the last time?

Q. I mean the first time.

A. I left it dozens of times.

Q. The first time. When did you start going out to sea?

A. I can't quite recollect that. It was early in the war; around 1915.

Q. How old were you at that time?

A. Fifteen. I might say that I juggled my age around a bit. I was a little anxious to get away and I shoved it a few years ahead and later on I shoved it back a few years.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Q. What do you mean you "juggled" your age?

A. Well, I might have said I was sixteen or seventeen when I wasn't that old.

Presiding Inspector: When you signed on?

The Witness: When I signed on. My folks were kind of opposed to it.

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. Have you juggled your age continuously since?

A. No. I have had a tough time catching up to how old I really was.

Q. For how long a period of time did you ship in and out of Australia? [5683]

A. Until I came up here: 1920. I didn't go back. Four or five years.

Q. Now, how many trips or voyages did you take out of Australia approximately during that period of time?

A. Oh, I couldn't say; fifteen or twenty. It depends on what you call a "voyage". I made many short ones. Some long ones, some fast ones.

Q. Would you say that you spent most of the time in Australian or on ships during that period of time?

A. On ships. I was getting around plenty.

Q. You have testified, I believe, that you were familiar with the labor situation in Australia at that time?

A. I was, in this way: That it didn't make much impression on me. I kind of remembered it more

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

later on and I remember it now, but I wasn't familiar because of my own active participation, but I had some relatives that were very active.

Q. Haven't you given interviews to the effect that you were familiar with the labor situation in Australia during that period of time?

A. Nobody can be in Australia and be a working person without being familiar with the labor movement.

Q. And then you were also familiar with the movement of the IWW in Australia about that time, were you not?

A. Yes. I was opposed to it.

Q. You were opposed to them? [5684]

A. The way it was down there, yes.

Q. You knew what the IWW was doing in Australia, did you not? A. Oh, yes.

Q. You knew that they were burning docks?

A. I did not. Never heard it yet.

Q. And you knew that they were sabotaging property in Australia? A. No.

Q. You knew that the IWW had been outlawed in Australia? A. At what time?

Q. During that period of time.

A. What period of time?

Q. Well, you are a trade unionist, aren't you? You are familiar with all these trade union matters?

A. I am familiar with quite a few of them.

Q. You tell me the time that the IWW was outlawed in Australia.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

A. I don't know. I never heard of it. As far as I know it never was.

Q. Was it a legal Union in Australia, considered as such?

A. Yes. There was very little difference between the IWW in Australia and the Australian Workers' Unions in there. They closely follow the pattern of the IWW yet. Now, you have to differentiate when you are talking about the Australian labor movement because it is complicated. [5685]

Q. Is your testimony, Mr. Bridges, that the FWW was not engaged in sabotaging and the destruction of property in Australia during the period of time that you were out to sea and shipping in and out of Australia?

A. It is my testimony, within my knowledge, and from everything I know—I have heard that the IWW engaged in sabotage in the United States, but know not one case of sabotage that has ever been proven.

Q. You knew then, did you not, that the IWW was engaged in sabotaging and in the destruction of property in Australia?

A. I did not; I don't now. I have heard of it.

Q. And you knew the nature and character of the IWW at the time you arrived in the United States in 1920?

A. I knew what I thought it was. It was a trade union to me, and a little better than some I seen around.



(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Q. Didn't you testify that you were in the general strike in Australia?

A. In the 1917 general strike, yes, sir, of the seamen.

Q. Who called that strike?

A. The Australian Seamen's Union, the Miners' Union, the Railway Union, and we were in a supporting position.

Q. Were you a member of any union at that time? A. The seamen's Union.

Q. Were they on strike?

A. They certainly were. [5686]

Q. Was the IWW on strike?

A. Not so much. I don't recall that particular phase of it, but the unions on strike were the bona fide labor unions of Australia and they struck the whole country.

Q. What do you mean by "Not so much?" Was the IWW on strike at that time?

A. I don't know. Everybody was on strike, whether the IWW or anything else. The whole country was on strike. It was a general strike. And the IWW, while I might not agree with them, I never found them strike breakers.

Q. Did I ask you that?

A. Well, it is in answer to your question. No.

Q. Please don't volunteer anything I don't ask.

A. I am only trying to be helpful.

Mr. Grossman: It was obviously in reply to the question asked as to whether they were on strike.

Presiding Inspector: Just reply to his questions.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

The Witness: All right.

Mr. Del Guercio: Your Honor, I have some material that I don't have here. May we have a short recess?

Presiding Inspector: Yes. We will take a short recess.

(Whereupon a short recess was taken.)

Presiding Inspector: You may proceed, Mr. Del Guercio.

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. Going back to Australia, in this 1917 strike who did you say called the general strike in Australia at that time? [5687]

A. It began in the railroad work shop in Newcastle, New South Wales, over the speed-up system. Certain men were fired and the union in the yards demanded their reinstatement. It was refused and the yard struck.

The railroad unions struck in sympathy with the yards.

The Miners struck in sympathy with the railroads. We struck in sympathy with the Miners.

Q. Did anybody else strike?

A. Everybody struck.

Q. Including the IWW organizations?

A. I don't recall that. They were not engaged in this particular—

Q. (Interposing): Is that the only portion of the general strike in Australia that you don't recall, the part that the IWW played in it?

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

A. I don't recall what part they played in it. There was enough other people to play a big part without considering them.

Q. As a matter of fact, you know that the IWW played the leading role and the leading part in that strike in Australia?

A. I know something exactly to the opposite.

Q. Now, was not the IWW active in Australia at that time?

A. The IWW was active almost in every part of the world I ever went.

Mr. Del Guercio: I move that that last answer be stricken [5688] and that the witness be instructed to confine himself to the questions that I am asking and not to wander all around.

Presiding Inspector: Yes; that is the rule.

A. I believe the IWW was active in Australia as well as everywhere else.

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. And isn't it a fact that about that time, just prior to the strike, they had a membership of about 15,000 throughout Australia?

A. I don't know.

Q. Aren't you familiar with the labor movement in Australia? A. I am.

Q. And isn't it a fact, and don't you know, and didn't you know at the time you arrived in the United States in 1920, that during the general strike in Australia, in 1917, the town of Sidney had been set on fire? A. No. I don't know it yet.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Q. And didn't you know that it had been set on fire by fire bombs?

A. I don't know it yet. I don't believe it.

Q. And cotton waste?

A. No. Who did they blame it on?

Q. Don't you know?

A. No. I know who was on strike, and it wasn't the IWW. [5689]

Q. And didn't—

A. (Interposing): There was a lot of that talk.

Q. Didn't you know at that time that the Steamer Cumberland, which was loaded with meat and supplies for England, was wrecked by an explosion of a bomb while en route between South Wales and Victoria?

A. If she was en route she was filled with strike breakers and anything could happen in that case.

Q. Didn't you know that the IWW were accused of causing that explosion—you knew that, didn't you?

A. I don't know it, but I can quite believe it. I know that the IWW were always accused of a lot of things; and not only the IWW, but I remember the trade union movement down there, the bona fide trade union movement that was on strike, was certainly accused of everything.

Q. Is that in answer to my question?

A. Yes.

Q. My question was, did you know whether or not the IWW were accused of causing the explosion on the Cumberland?

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

A. And I said everybody on strike was accused of doing a lot of things.

Q. Was the IWW accused of causing the explosion on the Cumberland?

A. I don't recall that specific case; but it is within my knowledge that I have heard the IWW accused of many, many [5690] things. I don't believe it.

Mr. Del Guercio: I move that the witness' answer be stricken, if your Honor please.

Presiding Inspector: It will save time to let it stand because immediately it will be followed by other questions along that line. I think I will let it stand.

You must confine yourself to the questions and not volunteer.

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. Isn't it true that two docks at Sidney were destroyed by fire and that the IWW were accused of starting that fire?

A. Not that I know of.

Q. You do know that two docks in Sidney were set on fire, don't you?

A. No, I don't. Sidney—Australia is a big country. I was a long way from Sidney at that time. I was in Melbourne.

Q. Is that in answer to my question?

A. Yes. I think you asked me if two docks in Sidney were on fire. I would have to be there to know it. I was in Melbourne.



(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Presiding Inspector: You are asking for knowledge here. He couldn't—

Mr. Del Guercio (Interposing): Answer "Yes" or "No".

Presiding Inspector: Listen—he couldn't know it unless he was there. If you want to insist on the word "Knowledge" [5691] in that sense—that is what he is trying to explain to you, the sense in which he takes your question in respect to "knowledge."

Mr. Del Guercio: If the Court please, the witness has already testified that he was participating in the 1917 strike and all these events are events in the 1917 strike.

Presiding Inspector: But that is a large country and he may not have been there.

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. Where, in Australia, were you at the time of the 1917—

Presiding Inspector: I think you mean personal knowledge.

Mr. Del Guercio: Any knowledge, wherever he may have gotten it, from newspapers or otherwise.

Presiding Inspector: He was trying to explain that.

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. Where in Australia were you at the time of the 1917 general strike?

A. Melbourne, Australia, living at home.

Q. Did you remain in Melbourne throughout that time—



(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

A. (Interposing): For the duration of the strike.

Q. (Continuing): —the duration of the strike? A. Yes.

Q. Did you participate in the strike?

A. As a rank and file member; yes.

Q. Were you on the picket line, or did they have picket [5692] lines?

A. They had picket lines; yes; but in a little different sense than what they might have them here.

Q. Did you participate in the picket lines?

A. Yes.

Q. Where? A. Melbourne.

Q. On the docks? A. Yes.

Q. Now, did you know that at the time of the general strike in Australia, in which you say you participated, that the Schooner *Miranda*—M-i-r-a-n-d-a—was destroyed by fire?

A. Numerous schooners were destroyed by fire.

Presiding Inspector: Do you know about that schooner?

The Witness: I used to follow very closely anything like that because I was sailing in those ships. It is possible I knew about it at the time, but I don't have any recollection now.

Was it during the strike?

Mr. Del Guercio: Yes.

The Witness: Those ships were manned by scabs and they were pretty dangerous. They carried case oil and they used to blow up every once in a while.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. Did you know, did you have any information at that time that the IWW ~~were~~ accused of causing the burning of the Schooner [5693] Miranda?

A. I have a pretty extensive knowledge of those ships because ~~I sailed on them~~ and the IWW was not active on those ships at all. I have no knowledge of the incident you are talking of.

Q. How far is Sidney from Melbourne, Australia?

A. 500 miles, roughly.

Q. Did you read the newspapers during the 1917 strike?

A. Sure.

Q. Did you read an article during that time headed "Australia IWW Try to Burn Sidney?"

A. No; but I have no doubt that articles like that appeared in newspapers. The newspapers are as bad in Australia as they are here.

Q. Did you read the papers around that time?

A. Sure.

Q. Did not the Government of Australia, because of the activity of the IWW in the 1917 strike, take action, legislative action, to outlaw the IWW in Australia?

A. They took legislative action, but not because of the IWW. They took legislative action the bona fide trade union movement to outlaw strikes, and a lot of other things.

Q. Didn't they pass a law providing for the deportation of any person, not a citizen of Australia, if he belonged to [5694] or was affiliated with the IWW?

A. Not that I know of.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Q. You have no information on that point?

A. None at all. I have relatives in Parliament down there. I know the acts they did pass. They passed a Transport Act requiring the licensing of seamen and longshoremen.

Q. With reference to the IWW, do you know what legislation they passed?

A. None to my knowledge.

Q. Would you say they didn't pass any?

Mr. Gladstein: I think the question has been asked and answered two or three times.

Presiding Inspector: I am not sure what he meant by "my knowledge."

The Witness: Meaning that this was a long time ago and it is pretty complicated. I left shortly after that, and they might have passed legislation shortly after, or at that time, and I wouldn't know about it. But I don't recall any, or know of any.

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. Did you know a man by the name of Mark Sheldon—M-a-r-k S-h-e-l-d-o-n? A. No.

Q. Commissioner for Australia?

A. No. Commissioner from where? [5695]

Q. From Australia, I suppose; from the Commonwealth of Australia.

A. Commissioner in the United States?

Q. Yes; Commissioner in the United States.

A. No. I hadn't come here then.

Q. Isn't it a fact, Mr. Bridges, that a law was passed in Australia about 1918, or 1917, making it

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

illegal for any organization, such as the IWW, to exist?      A. Not that I know of.

Q. Isn't it a fact that a law was passed in Australia—

Presiding Inspector: He says he doesn't know.

Mr. Del Guercio: This is another question.

Presiding Inspector: Another law?

Mr. Del Guercio: Yes.

Presiding Inspector: All right. Go ahead. I supposed his answer was quite full; that he didn't know about that.

Go ahead.

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. That a law was passed providing for the imprisonment or fine, and fine, of any person belonging to the IWW?

A. No, not that I know of. I know what was done, but it is not the way you express it.

Q. Will you explain what was done in regard to the IWW?

A. You can't separate the IWW from the rest of the labor movement because the laws applied to all unions. Strikes were [5696] illegal in Australia. It was under a system of compulsory arbitration. During the 1917 strike they had our President in jail, Tom Walsh. I went to see him in jail.

Q. Was he an IWW?

A. He was not. He was President of the Australian Seamen's Union.

Q. Was he also an IWW?      A. No.

Q. We are only talking about the IWW.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

A. And I point out that a strike was illegal, and they could throw you in jail for striking. So I can't see why they needed any such law, because that law applied to all unions. Our President went to jail, and a lot of other trade unionists went to jail.

Q. Where were you in 1919?

A. What part?

Q. Oh, for the period—the latter part of 1919, October, November and December.

A. I was on a ship called the Valmarie that sailed from New Zealand to Australia. She was wrecked on the coast of Australia. She went ashore at a place called "90 Mile Beach", 150 miles from Melbourne.

Q. Was that in 1919?

A. November, 1919.

Q. How long did you remain ashore then?

[5697]

Presiding Inspector: The ship?

Mr. Del Guercio: No. I am asking how long he remained ashore there?

A. I sailed again on that ship. We left Melbourne shortly before Christmas on this same ship bound back for New Zealand.

Q. And you remained ashore about a month?

A. More than that, I think. She went ashore in October or November, 1919. She stayed ashore for quite a while. She was towed off and taken to Melbourne to be refitted, and I worked on her while she was being refitted.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Q. Did you hear anything about that time as to what action the Government of Australia had taken toward the IWW?

A. None as far as I know.

Q. I believe you said that your second arrival in the United States was in 1920?

A. Well, if you call it an arrival. The first time I was here I was here with the crew of a ship. I went ashore as a member of the crew. [5698]

Q. Well now, you arrived in the United States as a member of the crew of the SS Ysabel, did you not?

A. I arrived here and left the ship here. That's what I call my "first" arrival, really.

Q. That's on the Ysabel?

A. Ysabel, yes.

Q. And when was that?

A. April, 1920.

Q. Was it April 12, 1920?

A. I believe so; sometime around there. I am not sure of the date.

Q. Where did you arrive?

A. San Francisco.

Q. And did you desert the ship at that time?

A. Under British law I deserted. Under American law I quit.

Q. Did you desert the ship at that time?

A. Under British law I deserted. Under your American law I quit.

Q. Was the Ysabel an American registry or British registry?

A. New Zealand registry.

Q. New Zealand registry?

A. Yes.



(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Q. And you were employed as a seaman there under [5699] British law, were you not?

A. Under New Zealand law; British.

Q. Under New Zealand law? A. Yes.

Q. You weren't paid off, were you?

A. I was. I left half my pay behind, or some pay behind I know.

Q. Then you weren't paid off. Were you discharged? A. It depends what you mean.

Q. Did the Captain tell you that you could go off the ship? A. No. I quit. I walked off.

Q. And where did you go after you left the SS Ysabel?

A. Do you mean when I went to sea next or what I had done next?

Q. Yes. Did you remain in San Francisco?

A. For a short while.

Q. For how long?

A. I can't recall; not very long. I shipped out again very shortly after.

Q. On what ship was that?

A. I think a Shell Oil tanker, the Silver Shell.

Q. Where did you go on it?

A. Oh, I can't recall now.

Q. Was it for a foreign trip?

A. I think it was. I think we—I think we went to [5700] China and Manila.

Q. Did you sign up for a round trip?

A. I guess I would.

Q. Huh? A. I believe I would in that case.

Q. As what? A. Able seaman.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Q. And when did you return to the United States?

A. I'm not sure. We returned in about a month or two, I think.

Q. And I believe you testified that you shipped in and out of San Francisco a number of times?

A. Yes.

Q. In 1920?

A. Well, not very many times that year. I think only once or twice more. For a few times towards the end of the year I think that I was sailing on the Coast for a short while. I can't recall how many times.

Q. Well, did you sign on the tanker Silver Bell in 1920?

A. Silver Shell?

Q. Shell, I mean.

A. Yes.

Q. That was in what? May, 1920?

A. I'm not sure. It could have been.

Q. It could have been. Did you sign on the SS [5701] Delisle?

A. Yes.

Q. Did you ship on it in San Francisco?

A. Yes.

Q. About when? After you returned from the Silver Shell?

A. Yes. It was afterwards. It might have been before the Silver Shell. I'm not quite sure of which one I took first.

Q. Did you also sign on the Fred Baxter?

A. Yes.

Q. From where?

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

A. Either San Pedro or San Francisco.

Q. And when were you paid off of the Fred Baxter?

A. I don't recall.

Q. Would it be the latter part of 1920?

A. It could have been. I am not sure.

Q. These trips that you were on, the SS Delisle, Silver Shell and Fred Baxter were all foreign, were they not?

A. Yes, I think they were.

Q. And I believe you also testified that during the latter part of 1920 you shipped on coastwise ships?

A. Yes. That is as far as I remember.

Q. Do you know the names of any of those coastwise ships? [5702]

A. Oh, I was on numerous runs for short periods of time. I can't remember now.

Q. Were you on the Charles Christensen?

A. I shipped on the Charles Christensen. I can recall that for a specific reason.

Q. Gray's Harbor?

A. Yes, I was on her too.

Q. When did you leave the West Coast in 1920, if you did leave in 1920?

A. I'm not sure. It might have been late in 1920 or—I am not sure. I can't remember that.

Q. Well now, directing your attention to your testimony regarding your joining the IWW in New Orleans—

A. (Interposing): Yes.

Q. (Continuing): —you testified that you joined the IWW when?

A. In 1921.

Q. What part?

A. The latter part of the year. It may be any-

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

where from July on. July, August or September is my best recollection.

Q. Now, when did you arrive in New Orleans with regard to the date of your joining the IWW?

A. Oh, I think about six or seven months before, maybe; somewhere between, say, four and seven months I think. [5703]

Q. As what? How did you arrive?

A. I went down by Morgan Line steamer from New York.

Q. Morgan Line steamer from New York?

A. Yes, as a passenger.

Q. As a what? A. As a passenger.

Q. As a passenger? A. Yes.

Q. And do you remember the date you arrived in New Orleans? A. I do not.

Q. The month?

A. I think it was in the early part. I think it was January or February; something like that.

Q. January or February of 1921?

A. Yes.

Q. And—

A. (Interposing) I know it was prior to the '21 strike. I made two or three short trips out of New Orleans.

Q. I am coming to that now. You arrived the first part of 1921 in New Orleans as a passenger on this boat, this Morgan Line boat?

A. That's right, I think.

Q. And how long did you remain in New Orleans before you shipped out?

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

A. I don't know; a few weeks, I think. [5704]

Q. And when was the first boat on which you shipped out?

A. I can't remember.

Q. Well, now, did you ship out before the strike?

A. Yes.

Q. On how many boats did you ship out on before the 1921 strike in New Orleans?

A. My best recollection is two or three, the last one getting back to port about 10 or 15 days after the strike started. I can remember that one. That was the James Timson, a mahogany packet that run down to Central America.

Q. Now, you said you arrived in New Orleans as a passenger and that you got on at New York?

A. I paid my passage from New York to New Orleans.

Q. Just prior to your going to New Orleans hadn't you been employed as a seaman?

A. Yes.

Q. And what was the last ship that you were on before your departure for New Orleans?

A. I think I made a second trip on the Delisle. No, it was a Luchenbach steamer and they laid her up in Boston.

Q. And when did you arrive in Boston?

A. I don't know, but I know the snow was about six feet deep.

Q. Well now, if the records of the Immigration office there show that you arrived there and paid off in February 5, [5705] 1921 would that be correct?

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

A. That could easily be correct, yes.

Q. So that you were in Boston on about February 5, 1921?

A. That's possible, yes. I am not too sure. If that's the case, of course I arrived in New Orleans much later. I am not too sure. That's a long while ago.

Q. Now, did you go from Boston to New York?

A. From Boston to New York by the small steamer that run down there, yes.

Q. If the records at the New Orleans office show that you signed on the SS James Timson on April 21, 1921 for a trip to Belize, British Honduras, would that be correct?

A. That would be correct.

Q. So you were not in New Orleans after April 21, 1921; is that correct?

A. I was in New Orleans. The records—

Q. (Interposing): You signed on this SS James Timson on April 21, 1921?

A. Right.

Q. For a trip to British Honduras?

A. All right.

Q. Did you go on that trip to British Honduras?

A. I did.

Q. And was it on April 21, 1921?

A. I can't recall, but if the records— [5706]

Q. (Interposing): If the records so show, would that be correct?

A. I'm sure they would.

Mr. Del Guercio: All right. I don't know



(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

whether I can assure him or not that the records so show.

Presiding Inspector: It isn't very material, is it?

The Witness: I came back and paid off that ship and went to the Marine Hospital in New Orleans for a few days.

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. All right. When did you return to New Orleans on the James Timson?

A. Very shortly afterwards. It was a short trip.

Q. If the records showed that you returned on May 25, 1921—no, wait just a minute, please! How many voyages did you go on the SS James Timson?

A. I don't recall, but I think it was only one.

Q. Well now, didn't you also go to Nicaragua on it? A. Yes.

Q. And wasn't that also in 1921?

A. Yes.

Q. And didn't you return from a trip to Nicaragua on the James Timson on February 25, 19—May 25, 1921? A. It's possible.

Q. And weren't you at that time held at the Immigration Office? [5707] A. No, I was—

Q. (Interposing): Weren't you detained at the Immigration Office after your arrival from Nicaragua?

A. No. We were detained in quarantine on account of fever. I went to the hospital for a check-

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

over. In quarantine the doctor looked us over and it was something that they looked us over for, and a half a dozen of us, I think, were told to report to the hospital for further observation. I believe it was a preventive measure because of some fever that was raging down in Nicaragua at that time or in Belize.

Q. Well, that was immediately upon your return from this trip to Nicaragua?

A. That was when I came off the SS James Timson. I went to the hospital, I know that, and was discharged immediately.

Q. Where is Bluefields?

A. Bluefields is in Nicaragua.

Q. Well, would you say that that is the correct date when you returned from Nicaragua? About May 25, 1921?

A. I think so. I think that would approximately be it.

Q. When did the strike in New Orleans start?

A. The beginning of May. I am not sure of the exact date. It may have been the first or the fifth or something like that.

Q. It might? [5708]

A. Yes. I know I came back in the middle of the strike.

Q. You were at sea when it started?

A. I was at sea when the strike was declared.

Q. As a matter of fact, you shipped out just before it was called, did you not?

A. Not "just before."

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Q. A short time before?

A. Two or three weeks before.

Q. Two or three weeks before?

A. Yes; shipped out in turn from the Union hall.

Q. Were you a member of any union at that time?

A. I was a member of the Sailor's Union of the Pacific and the Eastern Gulf Sailors' Association. I shipped out from their Union hall on my regular turn on the list.

Q. Did you vote on the question as to whether a strike should be taken? A. I did.

Q. Where?

A. I don't recall, but I voted.

Q. Well, when was the strike called? Or when was the discussion had as to calling a strike?

A. Discussions extended all the way back into the time I was on the West Coast in the Union meetings.

Q. And then you were a member of a union at the time the strike was called and during the strike?

[5709]

A. Certainly.

Q. And the strike was called by whom?

A. The International Seamen's Union of America.

Q. Any other unions participate?

A. Yes. The Marine Engineers Union participated and the others were in and out all the time.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Q. And you remained a member of the union there throughout the strike, did you not?

A. I did until after the strike.

Q. You did until after the strike?

A. That is, in so far as that I was in good standing. My dues were paid up, I was on the picket line and all the rest of it during the strike.

Q. How long did the strike last?

A. I'm not sure of the exact date. It lasted a couple of months and it kind of petered out on the East Coast. Nobody knew when it was off and when it was on. We would be told one day it was off and the next day it was on.

Q. Did it end—was it ended in June, 1921?

A. On the East Coast?

Q. No, in New Orleans. You were in New Orleans all this time?

A. That's right. That is what I mean. There was a division: The West Coast stayed on strike sometime after the East Coast went back to work.

[5710]

Q. Well now, was the strike ended in New Orleans in June, 1921?

A. I am not sure. It is possible.

Presiding Inspector: You count the Gulf as part of the East Coast?

The Witness: Eastern Gulf. That was the name. There were two divisions.

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. Why did you join the IWW?

A. When?

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Q. Why?

A. Why? Well, the strike was being sold out. It had gradually got to where it was nothing more than a racket. The leaders of the strike itself, the leaders of the International Seaman's Union at that time, although we had the lonshoremen lined up to support us in New Orleans, and they were perfectly willing to support us, the leaders of the International Seamen's Unions told them that we didn't need any support.

Q. But the strike was over, was it not, when you joined the IWW?

A. No. I joined during the strike.

Q. Huh?

A. I joined during the strike.

Q. Your testimony is that you joined in July, 1921. [5711]

A. I might be a little wrong as to dates. After all, you have got the record there.

Q. Well, your testimony is that you were a member of a union during the entire time of the strike.

A. I was a member of the——

Q. (Interposing): Of the Seamen's Union?

A. That's right.

Q. Could you be a member of two unions at the same time? A. I was.

Q. Huh?

A. I was a member of both of them, and I can tell you why I joined the IWW at that time and what——

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Q. (Interposing): How long did you remain a member of the IWW? A. A few months.

Q. Well now, as I get your testimony here, at one time you testified that you remained a member two months and another time you testified that you remained a member until the latter part of that year or the early part of the following year. Now which is correct?

A. I can't say which is correct. I am doing the best I can on dates. It's twenty years ago.

Q. Well, is it possible that you were a member of the IWW for more than two months? [5712]

A. Yes, it is.

Q. Is it possible that you were a member of the IWW for more than six months?

A. I don't think I would put it more than six months.

Q. Did you ever drop out of the IWW?

A. Oh, yes.

Q. Now, how, when and where?

A. I dropped out very definitely. I notified—I was on one ship when they had an organizer aboard there and he came around and tried to solicit me again, and I told him, for example, "No, I was in once. I'm out." And I told him the organizer in that field at that time that I was through.

Q. Now, what ship was that?

A. That was the Eldorado, the early part of '22.

Q. The early part of—and where did you ship on the SS Eldorado? A. New Orleans.

Q. Foreign?



(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

A. Yes. That was a foreign ship.

Q. And where did it go? A. West Coast.

Q. And who was the organizer of the IWW that you told?

A. I can't recall. I remember him when I was ashore. I remember him as being one of the organizers and I don't know his name.

Q. Well, would the manifest of the crew of the SS [5713] Eldorado refresh your memory?

A. It might.

Q. It might?

A. It might. You mean as to whom the IWW organizer on that ship was?

Q. Well, you said he was on the ship, didn't you?

A. The manifest might refresh my memory. I am not sure if it would.

Q. And just what did you tell this organizer of the IWW?

A. We used to talk about the IWW. I used to—

Q. (Interposing): With regards to your dropping out?

A. I told him I was through.

Q. Huh?

A. I told him that I had dropped out sometime prior to that.

Q. And what did he say?

A. And I dropped out in the official fashion.

Q. No, no. What did the organizer say?

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

A. Oh, I think he worked pretty hard on me to get me back.

Q. Did you give him—did you surrender your book to him at that time?

A. No, not to him. My book had already gone back. I am not sure about my book. I don't know what happened to that. [5714] As a matter of fact, I think I kept my book for quite a while.

Q. Can you drop out of any Union by just telling an organizer of the Union that you are dropping out?

A. You can drop out of any Union if you don't pay your dues over a certain period of time.

Q. Were you ever expelled from the IWW?

A. I never was.

Q. Huh? A. Never was.

Q. So that if I give you an opportunity now to refresh your memory would you be able to say exactly how long you remained a member of the IWW? A. I might.

Q. Huh? A. It is hard to say.

Q. How much time do you want?

A. Oh, do you mean just sit up here and think it over?

Q. Yes.

A. I don't think I could do any better than I have done.

Q. That's the best?

A. Well, it's not bad after twenty years.

Q. Did you—now, Mr. Bridges, didn't you testify at your previous deportation hearing in 1939

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

that you joined the IWW during the strike in New Orleans?

A. Yes.

Q. Was that correct? [5715]

A. I testified to the same thing here, and it's correct.

Q. You mean that your present testimony is also to the effect that you joined the IWW during the strike in New Orleans?

A. I am sure I said that yesterday or the day before and today. It's the truth.

Q. Did you have an interview with Theodore Dreiser of Los Angeles on October 4, 1940?

A. I did.

Presiding Inspector: The novelist?

The Witness: Yes.

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. And did you tell Mr. Dreiser that you joined the IWW after the 1921 strike because you saw how the A. F. of L. had sold out the strike?

A. I don't think so. I wouldn't tell him that. After all, putting it after the strike or before or during the strike wouldn't make any difference.

Q. To whom.

A. To Mr. Dreiser. And he might make a little slip here or there, if you know him.

Q. Well, is it possible that you did in fact join the IWW after the strike in 1921?

A. The best of my memory is during the strike.

Q. What became of your membership book in the IWW?

A. What was that? [5716]

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Q. What became of your membership book?

A. I don't know. I don't know. I wish I had it now.

Q. Who signed your membership book?

A. I don't remember that either.

Q. You have seen the membership book in the IWW that the Government has introduced in this hearing?

A. Yes.

Mr. Del Guercio: Do you have that here?

The Witness: I had a similar one.

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. You had a similar one?

A. Yes.

Q. And if I showed you this Government's Exhibit, the IWW book, you would say that you had a book similar to that?

A. As far as I remember, very similar.

Q. Were you ever in Mexico?

A. Yes.

Q. When?

A. Oh, I don't know. I think it was either—I was down there in 1920, I was down there in 1921 sometime for a while.

Q. Did you ever work in Mexico?

A. Tried to. I was out of luck.

Q. Doing what?

A. Oh, I was almost willing to do anything. I was [5717] hungry.

Q. Did you ever work in any oil field in Mexico?

A. No, I tried to.

Q. You didn't succeed in obtaining work?

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

A. No. They didn't need any riggers. I was looking for a rigging job.

Q. Did you tell Mr. Dreiser in the same interview that you had obtained work as a rigger in the oil fields in Mexico?

A. Well, he might have picked up the expression "As a rigger."

Q. Well, did you tell him that you had done work, had worked as an oil rigger in Mexico?

A. Possibly.

Q. That was not a true statement, was it?

A. It was.

Q. Well, isn't it your present testimony that you did not work in Mexico?

A. That isn't what you asked me. I have worked in Mexico in more ways than one. I am just trying to be clean on it.

Q. Did you ever work as a rigger in an oil field in Mexico. . . A. No. . .

Q. Did you tell Mr. Dreiser that you worked as a rigger in an oil field in Mexico? [5718]

A. Oh, we had a long conversation about that. He might have used the term "rigger."

Q. Did you tell Mr. Dreiser that you had worked as a rigger in an oil field in Mexico?

A. I don't think so. I told him what I did work at.

Q. Did Mr. Dreiser correctly quote you in the magazine "Friday" for October 4, 1940 when he said that you had told him that you had worked as a rigger in an oil field in Mexico?

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

A. That might be what you call a correct quote. He mightn't have got the technical term correct.

Q. Did Mr. Dreiser quote you correctly in this magazine "Friday" for October 4, 1940 when he quoted you as saying that you joined the IWW in New Orleans after the 1921 strike?

A. He might have quoted me correctly. He quoted me correctly on every substantial point. On minor points, such as dates or technical terms, it is entirely possible that there is a mistake here or there. That would possibly be my language instead of Dreiser's.

Q. Did Mr. Dreiser quote you correctly when he said that you joined the IWW because the A. F. of L. had sold out the strikers?

A. That was one of the main reasons I joined, whether he said it or not. If he said it, it's true. I mean, in that case the particular leaders involved.

Q. Is this in explanation of the—

A. (Interposing): Yes. I say I mean in that case the [5719] particular A. F. of L. individuals involved. I can name them.

Q. Now, you testified that you knew at the time you joined the IWW that it had anarchistic doctrines?

A. I didn't. I didn't testify to that. You mean at the time I left, I knew that?

Q. You left because they were anarchistic?

A. One of the reasons, yes.

Q. Now, what do you mean by "anarchistic"?



(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

A. Disorganized, leads to disruption, too fertile a field for provocative agents, and there were—too fertile a field for labor spies to work in, employers' agents. The place was full of them.

Q. How old were you at this time?

A. I was old enough.

Q. How old were you?

A. About twenty, nineteen.

Q. Had you ever heard the word "disrupter" at that time?

A. No only heard it. I knew some.

Q. Huh?

A. It wasn't a question of words. I knew one when I seen one or heard one.

Q. I believe you also used the word "syndicalist"?

A. "Syndicalist," yes.

Q. Do you know what it means? [5720]

A. I did and do now.

Q. And is that the reason you dropped out, because there were syndicalists and anarchists?

A. It wasn't a question of words. It was a question of tactics. But you're right. I didn't agree with syndicalistic views.

Q. No, I didn't say you didn't agree.

A. All right.

Q. Are you in favor of laws against syndicalism or regulating syndicalism?

A. No. It depends upon how you use the term. You might mean something different than what I

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

do. Explain what you mean by "syndicalism" and I will tell you.

Q. I would rather have you explain.

A. To me it simply means a trade union or an organization of workers that favors direct action at all times and with a complete disregard, and not only disregard but opposition, to any form of political action. That's what I mean by "syndicalism." And I am not in favor of laws to prevent a union being syndicalistic if they want to.

Q. And is it your testimony that all the laws, state syndicalism laws are directed against only organizations such as you describe?

A. Oh, no. Those laws were directed against all organizations.

Q. And what is your position with respect to those [5721] laws?

A. A hundred per cent against them, and I worked hard to get rid of some of them.

Presiding Inspector: What do you mean by "direct action"?

The Witness: "Direct action" means the use of economic action as against—that is, without any attention or resorting to the processes of mediation, arbitration, negotiation. In other words, you settle your disputes by walking off the job. You get everything by walking off the job. And that was generally the IWW policy. That works all right up to a point, but there comes a time when something has to be settled and a contract has got to be negotiated and signed and lived up to.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Mr. Del Guercio: Is the Court through?

Presiding Inspector: Yes. I wanted to get his understanding of the phrase.

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. Did you in 1921 file a Declaration of Intention in the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Louisiana in New Orleans?

A. A Declaration of Intention for citizenship you mean?

Q. Yes. A. Yes.

Q. And was that under oath? A. It was.

Q. And was all the information contained in that declaration [5722] true and correct?

A. To the best of my knowledge it was.

Mr. Gladstein: May I see it?

(The document referred to was passed to Mr. Gladstein.)

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. Now, I will show you a certified copy of the Declaration of Intention filed in the United States District Court, Eastern District of Louisiana in New Orleans, on May 7, 1920 by one Harry Renton Bridges, and ask you if that is your declaration?

Presiding Inspector: A copy of it.

Mr. Del Guercio: A carbon copy of the original.

A. That's right. This is my signature, and—that's right.

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. Did you at that time state under oath that you were born at Melbourne, Australia?

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

A. Yes.

Q. On the 28th day of July, 1899?

A. Yes.

Q. Is that the correct date of your birth?

A. No.

Mrs. King: If your Honor please, I think it is all immaterial.

Presiding Inspector: Well, of course, it's importance may be slight or great, but I think it is material. Contra- [5723] dictory statements made by the witness.

Mrs. King: The only thing is this, if your Honor please. It was some time ago when we offered character evidence in this case and you said there had been no attack on character evidence. If this kind of testimony—

Presiding Inspector: (Interposing), This isn't an attack on character.

Mrs. King: Certainly it is.

Presiding Inspector: No, not a direct attack. That doesn't open the door to proof such as you have suggested.

Mrs. King: Because it certainly is an attack on his veracity.

Presiding Inspector: An attack on his veracity in that particular.

Mrs. King: Yes. That seems to me under the—

Presiding Inspector: (Interposing) Oh, no.

Mrs. King: (Continuing) —rules laid down in Wigmore, that is exactly the thing which opens up the door.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Presiding Inspector: I think not. I won't dispute you about Wigmore, but I am confident——

Mrs. King: (Interposing) I have it here.

Presiding Inspector: (Continuing) ——that that is not the general rule. There may be all kinds of contradictory statements and you may claim, or the other side may claim that it does affect his character but that doesn't open the door to character witnesses to show by general reputation——[5724]

Mrs. King: (Interposing) What his reputation for truth and veracity is when there is an attack on his veracity?

Presiding Inspector: No, not unless there is proof that his reputation is the contrary.

Mrs. King: I don't believe—I would like your Honor to stop at this time, if I may, to discuss this whole problem, because, apparently there is an intention to attack it in this way. And it seems to me that it does open the door under the rules as laid down by Wigmore, that that is definitely the way not because there is a general attack on his reputation, but where there is an attack on him for contradictory statements.

Presiding Inspector: I will examine any authorities that you may submit to me. It is not the rule that I am familiar with.

Mrs. King: And it says here——

Presiding Inspector: (Interposing) It won't make any difference anyway. We would be entitled to take this. I would be entitled to take this.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Mrs. King: All right. But I just wanted you to realize that we are going to raise the contention—

Presiding Inspector: (Interposing) Oh, certainly.

Mrs. King: (Continuing) —if this type of evidence is introduced.

Presiding Inspector: I should think you would.

Mrs. King: That there has been an attack on Mr. Bridges' credibility, and that we will have to bring in a large number [5725] of character witnesses if this kind of thing is indulged in.

Presiding Inspector: If you are permitted to.

Mrs. King: Yes, if we are permitted to, of course, your Honor. But we feel that this is entirely outside the issue and it is an attempt to—

Presiding Inspector: (Interposing) Oh, this witness' credibility, of course, will be subject to attack.

Mrs. King: Yes.

Mr. Del Guercio: Of necessity it must be, if your Honor please.

Mrs. King: For truth and veracity.

Presiding Inspector: You don't need to say anything.

Mrs. King: As I say, these efforts to just whittle away on this kind of thing seems to us—

Presiding Inspector: Just exactly the same as you have done in certain of the witnesses.

Mrs. King: This does, though, as—

Presiding Inspector: (Interposing) Of course, the Government hasn't attempted to prove any good



(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

reputation. We haven't allowed it. There hasn't been any such thing suggested except in the case of Mr. Horn. But this is the first that we have heard of any contradictory statements with respect to Mr. Bridges.

I think we had better get along. When we come to your matter that can be taken up then. I would be very glad to see [5726] any authorities that you wish to submit.

Mr. Del Guercio: I want to make a correction there for the record.

Presiding Inspector: Go ahead.

Mr. Del Guercio: I have stated the wrong date that this declaration was filed. It was filed on July 3, 1921.

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. Is that correct?

A. That's the date, if that's the correct date on there. I didn't notice it.

Mr. Del Guercio: I offer this in evidence as Government's Exhibit next in order.

Mr. Gladstein: We object to it as immaterial, your Honor.

Presiding Inspector: I will receive it.

(The document referred to was received in evidence and marked Government's Exhibit No. 277.)

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. Do you have your discharge papers from any of the vessels on which you shipped?

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

A. I have some. I don't know exactly where they are. I could search for them and see what I can get together.

Q. You don't have them with you? A. No.

Q. Do you know what employment you had for the period [5727] from July, 1921 to March, 1922?

A. From when? July what?

Q. July, 1921 to March, 1922?

A. No. I can't recall offhand.

Q. Did you ever sign on the Chickasaw City?

A. Yes, I was on her for a while, anyway. I can't—

Q. Was it in July or August, 1921?

A. It might be around that time, yes.

Q. If the records show that you did, would that be correct or incorrect?

A. I was on the Chickasaw City during '21 and I would not dispute the record as to the month.

Q. You know, do you not, that a record of your arrival as a member of the crew is kept at the Immigration and Naturalization Office at the port of arrival? A. That's right.

Q. And that is made at the time of your arrival?

A. And it is noted on your passport, on your seaman's passport.

Q. And you were examined and inspected by an Immigration Officer upon each and every arrival from a foreign ship?

A. As far as I recall, yes. The ship wasn't allowed to dock.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Q. What?

A. The ship wasn't allowed to dock, as far as I recall, [5728] and no trip that I was ever on, the ship wasn't allowed to dock until that inspection had been made. [5729]

Q. Did you sign on the Lake Falama—F-a-l-a-m-a?

A. I think I did.

Q. What? A. I think I did.

Q. And where did you ship on it?

A. I don't—it may be New Orleans, it might have been Mobile, it might have been Vera Cruz.

Q. If the records show that you shipped on this vessel at Galveston, Texas, September 6, 1921, would you say that is correct?

A. It might be; although my recollection is it was at Vera Cruz.

Q. Vera Cruz, Mexico?

A. That might be the period of signing on. I might have been on the ship before—at the termination of the articles. It is my recollection that I picked her up in Vera Cruz.

Q. Were you paid off from this ship, the Falama on September 28, 1921, at New Orleans?

A. It is possible.

Q. So that you were not in New Orleans, were you, in July or August, 1921?

A. If the report shows I was on those ships, I was on the ships; I was not in New Orleans.

Q. Then you were not in—but you were in New Orleans the early part of July? [5730]

A. It is possible.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Q. Say, about the 13th of July?

A. It is possible.

Q. And you had been arrested in New Orleans, had you not?

A. During the strike?

Q. During the strike.

A. Yes.

Q. And do you know the date of that arrest?

A. No, I don't remember.

Q. Have you ever checked it?

A. No, I can't say I have.

Q. Have your attorneys checked the date of your arrest in New Orleans?

A. I don't know.

Q. Do you know that there is a record of your arrest?

A. I don't think there is. We were released without being booked.

Q. Well, Mr. Bridges, as a matter of fact you were booked, were you not?

A. I was booked?

Q. Yes.

A. I might have been; I am not sure.

Q. Do you know what you were charged with?

A. We were charged with loitering. We were on the picket [5731] line.

Q. I said "July". My records show you were arrested on June 11, 1921.

A. June 11?

Q. Yes.

A. It could be correct.

Q. You were in New Orleans on June 11, 1921?

A. I was arrested, sure, on the corner—I know the street.

Q. Were you a member of the IWW at the time of that arrest?

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

A. I was a picket captain at that time.

Q. Were you a member of the IWW at the time of that arrest?

A. I could have been; I am not sure.

Q. Was it because of your activities in the IWW that you were arrested?

A. It was because of my activity on the picket line.

Q. Was it because of your activities in the IWW—"Yes" or "No"?

A. No. I can recall the circumstances. The Mayor issued an order—

Q. (Interposing) I didn't ask for the circumstances, unless it is to qualify your answer.

A. It does qualify the answer. [5732]

Q. You mean it might not be "No"?

A. "No"—with qualifications.

Q. Were you ever employed on the SS Eldorado?

A. Yes.

Q. Where did you sign on?

A. New Orleans.

Q. When? A. I don't know.

Q. Could it have been October 11, 1921, if the records so show? A. It could be.

Q. And where were you paid off?

A. San Francisco, I think; maybe Seattle—maybe some—I was paid off on the Pacific Coast.

Q. If the records show that you were paid off in San Francisco, California, on November 12, 1921, would that be correct?

A. I would not dispute it.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Q. The records show that you signed on the SS Eldorado at Anacortes, Washington, November 30, 1921, and that you were paid off in San Francisco February 22, 1922, is that correct?

A. It is possible.

Q. I mean February 26, 1922, is that correct?

A. It is possible.

Q. Were those all of the vessels upon which you were employed [5733] during the period from July 1921 to March 1922, and I will list them again for you: The Chickasaw City, the Lake Falamá and the SS Eldorado.

A. As far as I recall. I remember—I am not sure if I made any trips, or if I worked on them, but I know I tried to ship on other ships; one Norwegian and one British, two British ships. I am not sure if I sailed on them or made any trips. As far as I know, I can't recall any others than you have outlined there.

Q. Now, the records show that you signed off the Lake Falamá on September 28, 1921, and then signed on the next ship, SS Eldorado, on October 11, 1921. From September 28, 1921 to October 11, 1921, where were you?

A. I don't know.

Q. Were you in New Orleans?

A. Possibly.

Q. If you signed on in New Orleans on October 11, 1921, would that refresh your memory?

A. If I signed off in New Orleans and I signed on another ship three weeks or a month later, the



(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

possibilities are I was in New Orleans. I can't remember.

Q. Now, were you ever employed on the SS Lydonia—L-y-d-o-n-i-a? A. Yes.

Q. That was a Coast Geodetic Survey about which you [5734] testified on direct examination?

A. That is right.

Q. And when did you sign on it?

A. I don't remember.

Q. If the records show it was on March 3, 1922 would you say that that was correct?

A. I wouldn't dispute it.

Q. And you were employed as what on the ship?

A. Quartermaster.

Q. You didn't sign on as Quartermaster, did you? A. I think I did.

Q. Did you sign on as an able bodied seaman?

A. That might be. I might have signed on as an able bodied seaman and was transferred, or given the Quartermaster's job a little later on.

Q. How long did you remain on that ship?

A. A few months; six or seven months, I think.

Q. And were you discharged?

A. I left; I quit. I have got an honorable discharge.

Q. Were you discharged because you needed hospitalization?

A. No—oh, yes. I was not discharged. Shortly after I went on there I had to go to the hospital for spinal meningitis. Then I went back to my ship.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Q. Was that at the Marine Hospital in Los Angeles? [5735]

A. San Francisco. But I went back to the ship after that.

Q. It was after that that you were promoted to Quartermaster?

A. I am not sure. I was acting Quartermaster before I went to the hospital.

Q. When did you say you were discharged?

A. From what?

Q. From the Lydonia?

A. I wasn't discharged.

Q. Wasn't it a fact that you were discharged at Oakland, California, October 4, 1922?

A. Discharged at my own request; yes. I left at my own request.

Q. You were discharged, weren't you? Isn't that the usual expression? A. All right.

Q. Seamen are discharged, aren't they?

A. No. That is not the way. They pay off.

Q. And are discharged?

A. And they get a discharge; a paper.

Q. And did you serve on that vessel while it was stationed at Coos Bay, Oregon?

A. Eureka and Coos Bay; yes.

Q. Now, on direct examination you stated that you couldn't [5736] recall your earliest employment on the west coast?

A. Not all that I had. I had short periods of employment. My earliest recollection, of course, would go back to my longshore work. After I quit

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

going to sea there were spaces in between, even during the time that I was working on the waterfront, that I had other employment for a short while.

Q. When did you first begin working as a longshoreman?

A. To the best of my recollection it was late in '22 or maybe early in '23.

Q. What does a longshoreman's work consist of?

A. A lot of hard work sometimes; but in general it is the work of loading ships, or loading cars on the docks; or discharging ships and discharging cars on the docks, generally speaking.

Q. Stevedore work?

A. Stevedore work; yes.

I think now I recall that at Christmas, 1922, I was working as a lumber piler in San Francisco, at Van Arsdale and Harris, Fifth and Brannon Streets.

Q. It was after that that you began working as a longshoreman?

A. No. I put in a little time before that. After I got through there, if I am correct, I worked for a while as a longshoreman and then I had other employment for a little while. [5737] I made a couple of trips here and there.

Q. Did you go to sea?

A. Not to sea, no. I went up to Oregon.

Q. Where?

A. I went up to Oregon for a few days, or a week, or something like that, and came back.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Q. When was that?

A. I don't know; some time in '23.

Q. It was after you were discharged from the Lydonia?

A. Yes. The last time I went to sea was on the Lydonia.

Q. What part of Oregon did you go to?

A. Portland and Coos Bay.

Q. After you began working as a longshoreman, what was the first employment you had as a longshoreman, and with whom, if you know?

A. I don't know.

Q. Was it with the California Stevedoring Company?

A. I don't know.

Q. Could it have been?

A. It could have been. I have an idea it was. I am not sure, though.

Q. Was there any union at that time?

A. No.

Q. In 1923, any longshoremen's union?

A. No; not a bona fide union. A company union. [5738]

Q. Was there a company union?

A. Oh, yes.

Q. What was the Company union known as?

A. The Longshoremen's Association of San Francisco; commonly known as the Blue Book.

Q. Was that the same Blue Book Union that was in existence in 1933?

A. Yes.

Q. That was in existence, you say, in 1923 also?

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

A. Yes. It was formed following the 1919 strike in San Francisco.

Q. Now, was that an A F of L Union?

A. No; it was a company union.

Q. Now, was there any effort made in 1924 to form a longshoremen's Union?

A. There was one formed; yes.

Q. By whom?

A. Lee J. Holman at that time—

Q. (Interposing) In 1924?

A. In 1924. I can only recall a few of the people. I recall Lee J. Holman; yes.

Q. Holman was active as a longshoreman at that time?

A. No; he was active in this particular union. He is the only one I can recall. There were others.

Q. Did you participate in an attempt to form a longshore- [5739] men's union?

A. I became a member at that time.

Q. Did you become a member of it after it was formed or were you one of the organizers?

A. Well, it was never really formed. I mean it never got established to any great degree. The membership, I think, grew to around 500; and we were all, in a way, organized, as far as individuals was concerned.

Q. Did you work with Holman to attempt to organize this union?

A. Not very closely.

Q. Did you work with anyone?

A. No; not to any great degree.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Q. As a matter of fact, you had nothing to do with the forming of that union, did you?

A. No, in that sense I wouldn't. If you mean to say was I a charter member, or active when the thing began, not at all.

Q. A charter had been given this union in 1924, had it not?

A. Oh, sure. It had been going for some time.

Q. By the A-F of L? A. Right.

Q. And you were not one of the charter members, were you?

A. No. I never said I was at any time. [5740]

Q. Didn't you testify in your previous hearing that—strike that. Now, what was that union called that was formed in 1924, the A F of L union?

A. I don't remember the exact designation, or the number of the charter. It was what was called the Red Book. It was a re-establishment of the old union that had existed in 1919. It had a number, but I just don't recall it now.

Q. Well, now—

A. (Interposing) I can check up and find out.

Q. Was it known as Local 38-33?

A. That is right; that was the number.

Q. Of the International Longshoremen's Association? A. Right.

Q. And that was an American Federation of Labor Affiliate? A. Right.

Q. And isn't it a fact that it had been on the waterfront since 1919?



(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

A. No—well, it all depends. If you mean that somebody—

Q. (Interposing) This Local 38-33?

A. That is right; that is correct. The charter had been kept in existence, maybe, by a small group of men. But when you say it had been on the waterfront, that simply means that a group of men got together, and paid dues, and talked to themselves—that is all it meant. [5741]

Q. Were you a member of 38-33?

A. Yes.

Q. Now, was there another local of the ILA in 1925 in San Francisco?

A. Of the ILA?

Q. Yes. A. No.

Q. There was 38-33?

A. As far as I recall that was the only one.

Q. Was there also a 38-69?

A. I don't think so; not that I recall. I might be mixed up in the local numbers. I don't recall any such local in 1925.

Q. Well, which one did you belong to, 38-69 or 33-38—I mean 38-33?

A. Well, I wouldn't be sure as to what the number was.

Q. Have you any way of checking?

A. I think I could check. I have a recollection—I am thinking now whether there was an ILA charter among the lumber workers, lumber clerks. I have some kind of a recollection there was.

Q. Did you have anything to do with obtaining of the charter for either 38-33 or 38-69?

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

A. No, actively, no.

Q. Were you a charter member of either one of those two [5742] locals?

A. In the sense that you only have to have ten members to get a charter, I was not one of them. I was one of the original members; that was all.

Mr. Del Guercio: I am going into a new subject. I don't want to go into it before lunch.

Presiding Inspector: We have seven minutes.

Mr. Del Guercio: I won't be able to complete it.

Presiding Inspector: You want to recess at this time?

Mr. Del Guercio: Yes.

Presiding Inspector: Two o'clock this afternoon.

(Whereupon, at 12:25 p. m. a recess was taken until 2:00 p.m. of the same day.) [5743]

---

After Recess

2:00 o'Clock P. M.

Presiding Inspector: You may proceed, Mr. Del Guercio.

### HARRY RENTON BRIDGES

called as a witness in his own behalf, having been previously duly sworn, testified further as follows:

Mr. Del Guercio: May I have the last question, please?

(The question and answer referred to were read by the reporter as recorded.)

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Cross Examination (Resumed)

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. Now, did you, on June 15, 1928, prepare and file with the United States Immigration and Naturalization Service, here in San Francisco, a Preliminary Form for Petition for Naturalization?

A. I did, around that time.

Q. And did you prepare it in your own handwriting? A. I think I did.

(Whereupon Mr. Del Guercio passed a document to Mr. Gladstein.)

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. I will show you Form 2214; Preliminary Form for Petition for Naturalization submitted by one Harry Renton Bridges, 37 Alpha Street, San Francisco, California, and ask you if that is the petition you prepared and filed? [5744]

A. (Examining document): Yes, sir; this is it.

Q. Is that filled-out in your own handwriting?

A. It is; and signed by me.

Q. Did you answer all of the questions on this petition? A. I did.

Mr. Del Guercio: I offer this in evidence as Government's next exhibit in order.

Presiding Inspector: It may be received.

(The document referred to was received in evidence and marked Government Exhibit No. 278.)

(Whereupon Mr. Del Guercio passed a document to Mr. Grossman.)

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. Now, did you, on the 9th day of August, 1928, file another Declaration of Intention in the U. S. District Court in San Francisco?

A. I did; about that time.

Q. And that was under oath? A. It was.

Q. Before the Clerk of the U. S. District Court here in San Francisco? A. That is right.

Q. I will show you a certified copy of a declaration of intention filed in the U. S. District Court at San Francisco on August 9, 1928, by one Harry Renton Bridges, and ask you if [5745] that is your Declaration of Intention, or a certified copy of your Declaration of Intention?

A. (Examining document).

Mr. Del Guercio: That is certified to as being a true copy by the Clerk of the Court.

A. (Examining document): That is correct.

Mr. Del Guercio: I offer this in evidence as Government's Exhibit next in order.

Presiding Inspector: It may be received.

(The document referred to was received in evidence and marked Government Exhibit No. 279.)

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. Now, you said—you testified, I believe, that you continued working on the waterfront in San Francisco up until the time you became an official of the Union in about 1934, is that correct?

A. That's right, with the exceptions that I men-

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

tioned: That there were spells or short periods in which I might have had other employment, but they were very brief.

Q. But your main employment was that of a waterfront worker in and around San Francisco?

A. Yes. I had no other employment that would last, say, more than five or six months during the entire time if you put it all together.

Q. Now, when did the Communist Party as such appear on [5746] the waterfront in San Francisco?

A. I don't know. I remember when I first saw Communist Party speakers on the waterfront.

Q. Well, you spoke of Communist Party speakers.

A. That's what I mean.

Q. In your previous testimony. Now, when was that? Around what period of time?

A. Around 1931 or '32 is my best judgment.

Q. Now, was the Marine Workers Industrial Union in existence at that time?

A. Not that I remember.

Q. Now, when did the Marine Workers Industrial Union come into existence here in San Francisco?

A. My earliest recollection of that is through Harry Jackson and I first recall meeting Jackson in 1932, I think. It might have been '33.

Q. Well, now, do you remember your testimony in the previous hearing regarding that?

A. Not specifically. I have read my testimony in the last hearing. I can't remember it all. But my testimony will be the same this time—I hope.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Q. That what?

A. I hope my testimony will be the same this time.

Q. Well, I hope, too, for your sake.

Mr. Gladstein: It is obvious that this is a question of [5747] recollection, your Honor.

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. Did you say you came in contact with Harry Jackson about that time? A. Yes.

Q. Now, that's the Harry Jackson whom you knew as a member of the Communist Party, is it not? A. Later on, yes.

Q. Well now, you knew at the time you first met him on the waterfront that he was a member of the Communist Party, did you not?

A. I don't think so.

Q. Now, you don't think so. What do you mean, you "don't think so"?

A. I connect him up at that time with the Marine Workers Industrial Union. There were Communist Party speakers there also and I have a distinct impression that I have got them separate.

Q. Well, Harry Jackson was one of those Communist Party speakers around that period of time, was he not?

A. That's not my recollection.

Q. Well, what is your recollection?

A. Well, there used to be speakers there—

Q. (Interposing): Well now, who were some of the speakers?

A. I can recall Sam Darcy, I can recall Jim



(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Branch, I [5748] can recall a young fellow named—no, a young fellow named Shannon used to speak on behalf of the Marine Workers Industrial Union.

Q. All right. You knew then that Sam Darcy was a member of the Communist Party at that time?

A. Yes, I did, I think.

Q. You knew that Jim Branch was a member of the Communist Party at that time?

A. They used to speak in the name of the Communist Party. That's how I knew it.

Q. That's how you knew that they were members of the Communist Party?

A. Well, when somebody gets up and says "Speaking on behalf of the Communist Party we advocate this, that and the other thing," I take it—

Q. (Interposing): Harry Jackson in the same manner also?

A. No. I don't recall Jackson doing that. I recall Jackson soap-boxing down there advocating and outlining the program of the Marine Workers Industrial Union.

Q. Now; was Harry Jackson connected with the Marine Workers Industrial Union?

A. I think he was, definitely.

Q. In what connection?

A. I think he was an official or an organizer.

[5749]

Q. Who was—the Marine Workers Union had a local there in San Francisco, didn't they?

A. I don't know about that time. I know they did

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

later on. My first recollection of them having any tangible office or anything was much later.

Q. When? How much later?

A. Oh, I would say around the end of 1933 or the fall of 1933.

Q. And who did you know at that time that were connected as officials of the Marine Workers Industrial Union?

May I have that question?

(The question referred to was read by the reporter as above recorded.)

A. Specifically that I am sure of there were Sam Telford—

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. (Interposing): Sam Telford?

A. There was Harry Hynes; a young fellow named Jim Shannon and Harry Jackson.

Q. Now, you knew that Sam Telford was a member of the Communist party, did you not?

A. I did not.

Q. When did you find out that he was?

A. I couldn't exactly remember. I found out eventually—I think he told me, but I can't remember exactly when it was. [5750]

Q. It might have been around this period of time?

A. I think it was a little later. I didn't meet Sam Telford, until much longer after I met Jackson. I didn't meet Telford, to my best recollection, until 1933.

Q. Telford was around here in San Francisco

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

during that period of time, was he not? '32 and '33?

A. He might have been; I don't know.

Q. Was he active on the waterfront at that time?

A. My first definite recollection of Telford was just prior to the 1934 strike.

Q. How about Shannon—you knew him to be a member of the Communist Party, did you not?

A. I am a little hazy on Shannon. My impression is that he spoke for the Marine Workers Industrial Union, but I am not sure; he might have been speaking for the Communist Party.

Q. Who was the other person you mentioned?

A. Hynes.

Q. You knew him to be a member of the Communist Party?

A. No, I didn't.

Q. When did you find out that he was a member of the Communist Party?

A. I never did.

Q. Huh?

A. I never did. [5751]

Q. Now, you said in the last hearing that the Marine Workers Industrial Union and the Communist Party became active on the waterfront about the fall of 1932, is that correct?

A. Substantially; a little difference in the dates, that is all.

Q. And that you cooperated with the Marine Workers Industrial Union?

A. In the way that I have stated.

Q. When did your cooperation with the Marine Workers Industrial Union begin?

A. During the strike of 1934.

Q. Wasn't it in fact prior to that time that you

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

started cooperating with the Marine Workers Industrial Union, prior to the 1934 strike?

A. No; I opposed them.

Q. When did you first meet Jackson?

A. To the best of my recollection, in '32; or it might have been '33.

Q. Where did you meet him?

A. On the waterfront.

Q. Did you have any meetings with Jackson about that time?

A. No more than standing on the curb and talking.

Q. You spoke to him? [5752]

A. On the curb, right on the waterfront.

Q. What did you talk to him about?

A. Millions of things.

Q. With reference to the Marine Workers Industrial Union and the Communist Party and their activities?

A. We argued all those things.

Q. Did you argue Communism with him?

A. I argued against it generally.

Q. You talked about Communism with Harry Jackson? A. Oh, sure.

Q. What stand did he take on Communism?

A. Favored it.

Q. He favored it?

A. Yes.

Q. That was in '32?

A. At that time, '32 or '33; I can't be exactly clear on the date.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Q. Then you knew in 1932 that Harry Jackson was connected with the Communist Party?

A. Not necessarily.

Q. What else did you talk about?

A. We talked about the waterfront, about conditions, about this union, that union and the other union, about seamen, about the MWIU, the "Wobblies", and everything.

Q. Did you talk about the activity of the Marine [5753] Workers Industrial Union on the waterfront?

A. Jackson was doing that most of the time that I can recall; that was his job.

Q. Was he talking to you all the time about this?

A. No; not all the time. He spoke to many others.

Q. Who was with you—were you alone with Jackson there?

A. No. We always used to gather around there; there were hundreds of us there.

Q. "We used to gather around there,"—who do you mean?

A. The waterfront longshoremen.

Q. The waterfront longshoremen gathered around Harry Jackson?

A. No; gathered around the waterfront trying to get a job.

Q. And Jackson was there and spoke to you about Communism and about the Marine Workers Industrial Union?

A. He spoke to me and hundreds of others.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Q. Did Jackson ever try to get you to join the Marine Workers Industrial Union?

A. Plenty of times.

Q. How many times?

A. I can't say off-hand; but numerous times.

Q. Now, during this period, prior to the 1934 strike, [5754] did you solicit members to join the Marine Workers Industrial Union?

A. No; just the opposite—I advocated that they join the Seamen's Union.

Q. Did you, during the 1934 strike, solicit anyone to join the Marine Workers Industrial Union?

A. To some extent, yes, but under different circumstances.

Q. I am not speaking about the circumstances. I am asking you whether you solicited anyone to join the Marine Workers Industrial Union during the 1934 strike.

A. If you mean that I took people up and urged them join it, I think you are right; I did.

Q. You know what I mean.

A. I am not sure I do.

Q. You took people up where?

A. To the Marine Workers Industrial Union hall and had them join the MWIU.

Q. How did you have them join—who did you take them to?

A. Well, I can tell you the whole story.

Q. Just a little at a time, and it might come out better.

A. I took them up to the MWIU headquarters.



(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Q. Who was at their union headquarters at that time? [5755] A. I forget.

Q. This is the early part of the 1934 strike, is that correct? A. The month of May.

Q. The month of May? A. Yes.

Q. How many people did you take up to the Marine Workers Industrial Union and urge them to join the Marine Workers Industrial Union?

A. Might be quite a few; anywheres from 20 to 100; might be.

Q. Would you say there were more than 100?

A. It is possible.

Q. 200? A. Might not be that many.

Q. And who would you take them to, any particular person in the Marine Workers Industrial Union Hall?

A. No; just the person that was in the union hall that had authority to sign members up.

Q. Would Harry Jackson be there?

A. It is possible.

Q. And it is possible also that you took a number of them to Harry Jackson, isn't it?

A. It is possible that he was up there on duty at that time. I don't specifically recall it, but I wouldn't say it [5756] wasn't possible.

Q. You wouldn't say that you didn't take anybody up to Harry Jackson and urge them to join the Marine Workers Industrial Union?

A. I don't remember it specifically.

Q. You knew then at that time, did you not, that Harry Jackson was a member of the Communist

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Party and active in Communist Party matters on the waterfront? A. I am not sure if I did.

Q. Your recollection fails you?

A. No; my recollection is pretty good.

Q. Now, you also testified that you went to 37 Grove Street, the headquarters of the Communist Party, and purchased literature, did you not?

A. Yes, I have been at 37 Grove Street.

Q. How much literature did you purchase there?

A. Oh, I can't recall. I did purchase some pamphlets and other things there.

Q. With your own funds?

A. With my own hard-earned money.

Q. How much literature did you purchase?

A. I couldn't say; I really couldn't say.

Q. What kind of literature was it that you purchased?

A. I wouldn't be too sure as to that now.

Q. But you are sure that it was Communist literature, [5757] are you not?

A. I am not even sure as to that.

Q. What are you sure about?

A. I am sure there was a book store there, and it was on my way home from work, and many times I passed it, and many times I stopped, and they had books and pamphlets of all descriptions on display in the window; and certain ones that took my eye I went in and bought them.

Q. And you can't remember at this time, of course, which ones caught your eye at this time and that you purchased?

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

A. No, I can't. I mean——

Q. (Interposing): Huh? A. No, I can't.

Q. What did you do with that literature?

A. I read it.

Q. And did you get anything out of it?

A. Well, I can't exactly remember that, but I possibly did. Otherwise I don't think I would have purchased it.

Q. And you retained since then most of the stuff you read in it and applied it?

A. I don't know how to answer that one.

Q. You knew, did you not—strike that. You had been on the San Francisco waterfront, you said, since about 1923? [5758] A. That's right.

Q. And you had heard Communist Party speakers there on the waterfront? A. I had.

Q. And you knew, did you not, that 37 Grove Street at that time was the headquarters of the Communist Party?

A. I'm not sure that I did.

Q. Would you say that you didn't know?

A. No, I wouldn't say that either. I have no distinct recollection. I know there was a book store there. That's what I was doing there.

Q. Did you take anybody to that book store to purchase literature with you?

A. Not that I know of. I don't think I did.

Q. To whom did you distribute the literature, the Communist Party literature that you purchased at 37 Grove Street?

A. No one. I read it myself. That's what I bought it for.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Q. Did you retain it?

A. I think I did for some time. I might still have some of it yet. I am not sure.

Q. Oh, you have some of the literature that you purchased at 37 Grove Street? Still have?

A. It's possible. I have a lot of— [5759]

Q. (Interposing): What are the names of some of the books and pamphlets that you purchased?

A. I have a great many books that you might think are Communist but I might disagree with you.

Q. Let me be the judge of that. Show them to me.

A. I haven't them with me.

Q. What are the names of some of them?

A. I have Marx' "Capital".

Q. You purchased that at 37 Grove Street?

A. No, I didn't.

Q. Well, those that you purchased at 37 Grove Street:

A. I am trying to think. I can recall purchasing some books or pamphlets giving the stories of certain strikes, or something. It seems to me that one of them was the story of the Passaic, New Jersey strike.

Q. By whom?

A. I can't recall. That book shop used to have all kinds of books and literature.

Q. Well now, you knew that it had nothing but Communist Party literature in that book store, don't you?

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

A. No, I know nothing of the kind and that is not correct.

Q. That book store was run by the Communist Party, was it not?

A. Well, if I am going to keep out of places because [5760] of who they are run by, I won't be able to do much shopping in this city.

Q. I didn't ask you that. You knew that that book store at 37 Grove Street was run by the Communist Party?

A. Not particularly I didn't.

Q. What do you mean "not particularly"?

A. I was up there purchasing a book.

Q. Well, I asked you if you knew that it was run by the Communist Party?

A. And I have no distinct recollection that I knew it.

Q. When did you find out that it was?

A. I don't know that either.

Q. Huh?

A. But I presume, looking back, that maybe some time in '34; early in '34. That's the best I can do.

Q. You knew, of course, that it did sell Communist Party literature at that book store, did you not, at that time?

A. I think that would be natural. I am pretty sure that if I was in there—after all, I can read English. I have a general idea of what Communist Party pamphlets are, and if I was in there purchasing other pamphlets I believe I would know that they had Communist Party books on sale. I have no

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

recollection of it maybe right now, but I wouldn't [5761] be that stupid, maybe.

Q. Didn't you testify—didn't you at the last hearing testify that you knew that they did sell Communist Party literature at that book store?

A. I don't know. I might have. I don't remember what I testified to at that hearing. I haven't testified differently now.

Q. Well, is your testimony now that you knew in 1934 that they sold Communist Party literature at the book store at 37 Grove Street?

A. No. I have already told you my recollection. Of course, two years ago—that testimony is a couple of years ago.

Q. Without referring to what you have already said, what is your testimony now?

A. My testimony is that I have no distinct recollection right now that I knew that it was the Communist Party headquarters. Or that—I also said that if I was up there purchasing books I would know enough to know a Communist Party pamphlet if I seen one, and if they was in that book store I would see it and know what it was. And it might have been early in 1934. That's the way I remember it now.

Q. Now, you knew—you say you could distinguish in 1934 between Communist Party literature and non-Communist Party literature, is that right?

A. I think that's correct. [5762]

Q. Now, having that in mind, that distinction in mind, what kind of literature did you purchase at 37 Grove Street?



(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

A. I could purchase many kinds of literature.

Q. I am not asking you what you could purchase. I am asking you what you did purchase.

A. If I can remember, I'll tell you.

Q. Now, you have retained some of the books, you have testified. You still have some of the books?

A. I have many books. I am just trying to see if I can get any sorted out that I got at that time from that store. I'm not quite sure what they are. I have many books and pamphlets. I couldn't—

Q. (Interposing): A little hazy on that subject?

A. Well, for example, I could guess. I don't want to do that. At that time there were a lot of pamphlets floating around. There was a pamphlet, for example, explaining the workings of the NRA. I might have picked—

Q. (Interposing): I am not asking you about pamphlets of the NRA. I am asking you about Communist Party literature. You understand me, of course, don't you?

A. You mean what I think is Communist Party literature?

Q. Yes.

A. No. I don't know what—I don't think I have got what I think is Communist Party literature that I purchased at that book store.

Q. How many times did you visit that book store? [5763]

A. Not very often. I can't recall definitely, Maybe two, three times or so.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Q. Did you ever walk in there with Harry Jackson?

A. I don't recall ever seeing him there.

Q. Huh? A. No.

Q. You might have? A. I don't think so.

Q. Did you ever go in there with Sam Darcy?

A. No.

Q. With Telford? A. No.

Q. Sam Telford?

A. My recollection is that I didn't meet Telford until around the '34 strike. I had a lot of time on my hands. I used to do a lot of reading.

Q. Is that an answer to the last question? I thought you were a hard worker at that time.

A. Ah, I was. But—

Q. (Interposing): What is a "star gang", Mr. Bridges?

A. A star gang used to be a gang that got the preference of the work on the waterfront. In other words, they got more work, literally speaking, too, than the general run of the men on the waterfront.

Q. Did you ever belong to the star gang?

A. Much too long I did. [5764]

Q. Now, how many times did you meet Tom Raye? A. Tommy Raye?

Q. When you took these men here to join the Marine Workers Industrial Union?

A. Never met him.

Q. Never met him? A. Not—

Q. (Interposing) Prior to the 1934 strike?

A. Never met Tommy Raye until 1937.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Q. Did you ever meet Roy Hudson?

A. In 1936 I met Roy Hudson for the first time that I recall.

Q. How can you say—what fixes the date 1937 in your mind as meeting—Roy Hudson, was it?

A. No, Tommy Raye.

Q. Tommy Raye. What is it that occurred at that time that fixes that date so definitely in your mind?

A. A conference of longshoremen and seamen in New York in June, 1937 that Tommy Raye attended.

Q. Tommy Raye was there?

A. Yes. And Tommy Raye—

Q. (Interposing) And you spoke to him?

A. What?

Q. And you spoke to him? [5765]

A. Yes.

Q. Were you introduced to him?

A. Yes.

Q. By whom? A. I forget.

Q. Oh, you—

A. (Interposing) I do meet a lot of people.

Q. You do? A. Yes.

Q. Like Tommy Raye and Sam Browder?

A. Well, I don't know. It depends. You mean they look alike?

Q. You can't remember, then, who introduced you to Tommy Raye?

A. Not the particular individual, no.

Q. What was your position at that time in 1937?

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

A. President of the Pacific Coast District of the ILA.

Q. What was Tommy Raye's position, if any?

A. I think, if I am not mistaken—I think he had some official position, if not the Secretary of a New York Marine Council.

Q. New York Marine Council?

A. Or New York Marine Committee of some kind.

Q. You don't know, do you? Are you sure about that?

A. Yes, I am sure. If you mean on the marine— [5766]

Q. (Interposing) No, as to whether Thomas Raye had any connection with any Union at that time?

A. Sure, I am sure. I am positive. There was a functioning committee, a marine committee that Tommy Raye was either the Secretary or the Chairman of at that time. And I am positive.

Q. What was he connected with?

A. This Council or this Committee. There was a committee formed in New York on the same pattern as our Maritime Council in San Francisco and the other West Coast ports.

Q. And you were attending this conference?

A. Oh, no.

Q. What were you doing?

A. I was back East in Washington and New York conferring with the leaders of the CIO.

Q. Well, what were you doing at this particular

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

conference where you met Tommy Rave, where you were introduced to him?

A. Oh, we were discussing the possibilities of the East Coast longshoremen affiliating with the CIO.

Q. Well, was it an arranged meeting?

A. Yes.

Q. Who arranged it?

A. I'm not sure. It was arranged at my request. I forget [5767] who I asked to arrange it now. I think it was arranged by Rathborne.

Q. Mervyn Rathborne? A. Yes.

Q. And when did he arrange it?

A. At that time.

Q. Was he with you?

A. I'm pretty sure he was.

Q. You had nothing to do, then, with the arrangements? You left that all to Mervyn Rathborne? A. Yes.

Q. And with whom did he arrange this meeting or conference?

A. With all the people that attended.

Q. That attended what?

A. The conference.

Q. Where did he go? Whom did he contact?

A. He contacted the people I wanted him to contact: seamen and longshoremen.

Q. Did you give him particular persons you wanted contacted?

A. No, I didn't know them. He knew them. I asked him to get me a delegation from Boston,

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

from Philadelphia, from New York, from Newport News, from Norfolk, from Brooklyn and some from New York as well as some of the seamen there, [5768] because I wanted to talk over the possibilities of CIO.

Q. And Mervyn Rathborne went out and got those delegations?

A. He was stationed in New York. I worked out of his office at that time. He was much better acquainted than I am.

Q. Where was Mervyn Rathborne's office at that time?

A. 10 Bridge Street in New York City. He was president of the ARTA.

Q. And you went out there and met him. Now, what were you doing on the East Coast at that time?

A. I was back East to—I was back East on something or other. I think that it was to confer with John L. Lewis and John Brophy of the CIO.

Q. Had you conferred with John L. Lewis prior to going to New York to attend this conference?

A. Yes. I had to go to New York, I think, from Washington.

Q. And you say Mervyn Rathborne arranged for all these people to come there? A. Yes.

Q. And you didn't tell him what people to contact? A. Oh, I mentioned some of them.

Q. Did you mention Tommy Raye?

A. No.



(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Q. He went out and got Tommy Raye himself? [5769]

A. Tommy Raye, as I say, had the official position in this committee, as I recall it.

Q. What committee? Did the conference have a committee, too? A. No, the conference—

Q. (Interposing) What committee was there?

A. Tommy Raye's position at that time was in an official capacity with this Maritime Committee or Maritime Council.

Q. Well now, this was just a conference that you attended? A. That's right.

Q. And it was called for what purpose?

A. For me to talk with them.

Q. Just for you to talk with them? Nothing else?

A. No, that's all. And for them to talk to me.

Q. About what?

A. About CIO affiliation of East Coast longshoremen.

Q. Now, can you tell me the names of some of the other persons that attended that conference?

A. I can't.

Q. Huh?

A. I can't. Most of them were strangers to me, after all.

Q. What? [5770]

A. Most of them were strangers to me.

Q. Tommy Raye wasn't strange to you, was he?

A. Tommy Raye wasn't strange to me?

Q. Yes. A. First time I ever met him.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Q. And you remember Tommy Raye?

A. Oh, well, I saw him later.

Q. And you can't remember anyone else that you saw at that conference but Tommy Raye?

A. Well, they haven't played such an important part. The fact that Tommy Raye is mentioned here, in the Dies Committee and all over the country. The other fellows I met with them were either just minor officials or ordinary rank and file longshoremen.

Q. The reason you mentioned Tommy Raye is because you know that he has played a very active part in Communist Party activities since 1932?

A. No, I don't.

Q. Huh? A. No, I don't.

Q. You remember Thomas Raye because you know he went to Moscow, to Soviet Russia there in 1932 and returned about the time that the Marine Workers Industrial Union was formed on the West Coast here?

A. No, I don't. [5771]

Q. Is that the reason you remember—

A. (Interposing) No.

Q. (Continuing) —Thomas Raye?

A. No. The reason is what I told you.

Q. And he is the only person that you remember at that conference?

A. Oh, no. I never said that.

Q. Who else was there?

A. Rathborne was there.

Q. Your friend Mervyn Rathborne?

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

A. Yes. I think Joe Curran was there.

Q. Your friend Joe Curran was there?

A. Yes. And that is not the only reason I remember Tommy Rave. I never said that that was the only reason I remember him. I have a distinct recollection of why I remember him.

Q. Did he urge you to join the Communist Party at that time or had you already told him that you were a member?

A. I don't think either thing happened.

Q. Huh?

A. But I can still remember why I remember him.

Q. Where did you meet Roy Hudson?

A. My first recollection is 1936.

Q. Where? A. San Francisco. [5772]

Q. Under what circumstances?

A. He come up to my office.

Q. Roy Hudson came up to your office?

A. Yes.

Q. Your office was where at that time?

A. 112 Market Street. [5773]

Q. Was he alone?

A. As far as I remember; yes.

Q. And was there anyone in your office at the time? A. Not that I remember.

Q. All right. What did he come up there for?

A. Oh, just for a general talk; came in and said "Hello."

Q. To renew acquaintances?

A. No; I had never met him before.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Q. What did he talk about?

A. The Maritime situation, possibilities of the strike—all that—the situation on the east coast.

Q. Anything else?

A. Not that I can remember.

Q. Of what union was Roy Hudson an official at that time?

A. I don't know—that is, I forget—I don't know if he was a member of any union at that time.

Q. As a matter of fact, you knew that he wasn't a member of any union?

A. I didn't; I didn't.

Q. Did he tell you that he was?

A. I can't remember that.

Q. Well, you were an official of a big union at that time, weren't you?

A. That doesn't say that I can't talk to people not members of unions. [5774]

Q. What else did you talk about?

A. I can't recall anything else than what I have told you. We discussed the Seamen situation, both east and west, and we discussed—

Q. (Interposing) Let's stay with the Seamen's situation. What did Roy Hudson say about the Seamen's situation?

A. That it had improved a great deal by their organization of the CIO—

Q. (Interposing) By the organization of the CIO?

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

A. Not into the CIO, but their organization into the Defense Committee, and a drive against, at that time, a drive was on against the ISU.

Q. What did Roy Hudson have to do with that?

A. Well, I don't think it was on the basis of what he had to do with it. He had, as I recall it, recently came from the east and he was telling me about this in a general way.

Q. Telling you about the situation in the west?

A. He didn't have to; I knew more about that than he did.

Q. What?

A. I knew more about that than he did.

Q. He came up to talk to you about it?

A. Yes.

Q. What did he say about it—is that all he said? [5775]

A. About the situation in the east?

Q. In the west.

A. I can't recall him telling me anything about that. We discussed it, of course. We discussed the west coast situation. But the main emphasis, I think, was on the east coast situation, the activities of the CIO, and things like that.

Q. Was the CIO active at that time?

A. Oh, yes; oh, yes.

Q. That was in 1936?

A. In 1936; yes.

Q. Was Roy Hudson connected with the CIO movement at that time?

A. I don't think he was; not that I remember.

Q. You knew, did you not, at that time that

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Roy Hudson was on a committee, but it was the Central Committee of the Communist Party, did you not? A. No; no.

Q. That is the reason he came out to see you in 1936? A. I don't think so.

Q. You knew he wasn't connected with any union? A. I did not.

Q. You knew he was not a trade union man, didn't you? A. I did not.

Q. Didn't you? [5776] A. No, I did not.

Q. You knew he was known as the "Bishop", did you not, even at that time?

A. No. I heard that expression here.

Q. For the first time? A. Yes.

Q. Did Roy Hudson tell you that he was coming over to see you as one trade union man to another?

A. No; I don't think he put it that way. My girl came in and said Roy Hudson was outside and would like to see me. I said "Show him in." I am not too fancy to speak to anybody.

Q. Did you know of Roy Hudson at that time?

A. Did I know of him?

Q. Yes. A. Oh, yes.

Q. What had you heard about him?

A. I had heard that he had been active in maritime affairs.

Q. What kind of maritime affairs?

A. Trade Union maritime affairs.

Q. Was he a Trade Union man?

A. As far as I know he was.



(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Q. You said you had heard of him. Tell me all you heard about Roy Hudson?

A. I heard he had been active in trade union affairs; [5777] that during the early days of the NRA that he was trying to organize the West Coast seamen and longshoremen—I mean the East Coast seamen and longshoremen, not the West Coast.

Q. I don't want you to get mixed up.

A. I won't.

Q. Was it the East Coast?

A. The East Coast seamen and longshoremen.

Q. Not the west coast? A. East coast.

Q. What else did you hear?

A. That is about all.

Q. You hadn't heard about his Communistic activities, had you? A. Such as what?

Q. Such as anything?

A. Well, I don't know what you mean by "such as anything." You have got to understand that at that time, or for two or three years prior to that time, everybody that was active as a unionist was a Communist almost, and still are.

Q. Had you heard that Roy Hudson was connected with any union, any legitimate union?

A. My distinct impression is that I did and had.

Q. With what union?

A. I can't remember. I think it was the Marine Workers [5778] Industrial Union that at-

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

tempted to organize both longshoremen and seamen on the east coast.

Q. Now we are getting somewhere. You had heard that Roy Hudson was associated with the Marine Workers Industrial Union?

A. I never said that.

Q. As a matter of fact, that is the only union, if it is a union, or if it ever was a union, that Roy Hudson was connected with?

A. I don't know; I don't know.

Q. Had you heard he had been connected with any other union?

A. I can't remember; not that I can recollect.

Q. And how long did Roy Hudson remain in your office?

A. I don't know. I wouldn't remember that.

Q. Could you state approximately?

A. Could I guess?

Q. Approximately?

A. Well, approximately is another word for "good guess". I would say from half an hour to an hour, or from 15 minutes to an hour.

Q. What time of day did he go there?

A. I don't remember. I know the girl was working so it was within the regular working hours.

Q. It was during working hours?

A. Yes. [5779]

Q. So it must have been on business that Roy Hudson was coming up to see you about?

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

A. Well, if everybody came up to my office on business I would get more work done than I do.

Q. Give me your best estimate on how long Roy Hudson was up in your office?

A. Anywhere from ten or fifteen minutes to an hour.

Q. Did you talk about the times that you and Roy Hudson had during the 1934 strike?

A. No; he wasn't here in 1934.

Q. You are sure that Hudson was not in San Francisco at any time during the 1934 strike?

A. If he was he had no active part in the strike. Anybody that had any active part in the strike I knew.

Q. Didn't he have an active part in the strike, and particularly during the time that the general strike was called?

A. Not that I remember. What part?

Q. Didn't you play a leading part, or didn't you want to have this Court believe that you played a leading part in the 1934 strike?

A. I done my share.

Q. Don't you know all of the persons that were active and playing a leading part in the 1934 strike?

A. As far as I know I think I do. [5780]

Q. Well, now, having that in mind, didn't you meet Roy Hudson—

A. (Interposing) No.

Q. (Continuing) —in San Francisco in 1934?

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

A. No; and he had no active part in the strike whatsoever.

Q. And particularly in July of 1934?

A. No; definitely not.

Presiding Inspector: There was an answer you gave some time ago in which you said that in those days every longshoreman was a Communist. Now, what did you mean by that?

The Witness: In 1934, your Honor, and especially during the 1934 strike, although the strike was under the leadership of the San Francisco Labor Council, the entire strike leadership, and practically the entire rank and file on strike, were attacked as Communists. So the accusation of being a Communist doesn't, or at that time didn't mean a great deal to any of us. It was passed off as a little more employers' propaganda. The same thing has generally been true, as far as our experience has been, since.

That is all I meant.

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. What was the official organ of the 1934 strike? A. What part of it? [5781]

Q. Any part. A. Any part of it?

Q. The first part, the first part of the 1934 strike.

A. Let me see—I will have to break it down. What do you mean—do you mean the official organ of this or that union?

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Q. Of the one you were connected with, your strike committee.

A. The official organ of the longshoremen's strike?

Q. Now, you are asking me.

A. I am asking you what you mean.

Q. Strike that last question. I will put it this way: Was the Western Worker ever the organ of the Strike Committee, or of your union?

A. You mean the longshore Strike Committee?

Q. Yes. A. No.

Q. Of what was it the organ?

A. The Communist Party.

Q. And did you adopt it, did you have anything to do with adopting the Western Worker as the organ for the Strike Committee? A. No.

Q. At any time?

A. No. We never did. [5782]

Q. Now, to go back to the "Bishop".

A. To who?

Q. Roy Hudson. Didn't he make a speech here in San Francisco during the 1934 strike?

A. Not that I know of.

Q. If he had would you know about it?

A. If it had anything to do with the strike I think I would.

Q. If it had anything to do with the 1934 strike you would have known about it?

A. It all depends on where he made it. If he made a speech up in some room by himself I

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

wouldn't; if he made a speech before any large group of people I would.

Q. Do you know if he is in the habit of making speeches in his own room?

A. I don't know him well enough to know. But if he made a speech before any large group during the 1934 strike I would know about it.

Q. You would know about it? A. Yes.

Mr. Del Guercio: May we have a recess?

Presiding Inspector: We will take a short recess.

(Whereupon a short recess was taken.)

Presiding Inspector: You may proceed, Mr. Del Guercio. [5783]

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. Didn't you testify at the last hearing that the Communist Party made an offer to make the Western Worker available to you? A. No.

Q. To whom was the offer made?

A. There was an offer made to the Strike Committee that they would print for us a daily bulletin and we accepted that.

Q. You were the Chairman of the Strike Committee at that time?

A. And under its orders; yes.

Q. You were the Chairman? A. I was.

Q. And who made the offer, who with the Communist Party made the offer to make available the Western Worker?



(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

A. They sent a delegation down there that appeared before the Strike Committee.

Q. More than one person?

A. Two or three, if I recollect right.

Q. Who were they?

A. Darcy, Lawrence Ross, and I am not sure whether Hanoff was there or not.

Q. Darcy, you are sure of Darcy?

A. I am pretty sure of Darcy, and I am pretty sure of Ross. He was the editor of the Western Worker. [5784]

Q. You are not sure of Hanoff—was it Elmer Hanoff?

A. I am not sure of the third man.

Q. He, Hanoff, might have been there?

A. He might have been.

Q. And who requested them to come down to the Strike Committee?

A. I think they thought it up themselves.

Q. And you presided at that meeting?

A. I did.

Q. Now, when, during the 1934 strike, did this occur?

A. I think shortly after it began.

Q. And this was before the General Strike Committee of which you were,—not the General Strike Committee, but the Strike Committee of which you were Chairman?

A. I was Chairman of two Committees.

Q. Which one was it that they appeared before?

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

A. The Longshore Strike Committee of Local 38-79, ILA.

Q. And during what portion of the 1934 strike did they come down there?

A. The early part; some time during the first week of the strike is my best recollection.

Q. And who spoke on behalf of this delegation, as you called it, Darcy, Hanoff, or Ross?

A. I don't recall. I think it was Ross.

Q. What did he say? [5785]

A. Offered us, said that the Western Worker Publishing Company, or the publication, had printing facilities and paper, and that in order that a Strike Bulletin would be available daily to the workers, and people interested in the strike, and inasmuch as they had heard that we were very short as far as finances were concerned, they made us an offer that their printing facilities—

Q. (Interposing): They made who an offer?

A. The Strike Committee.

Q. Sitting as a whole?

A. Sitting as a whole—made an offer to the Strike Committee that they would print a bulletin every day, composed of material furnished them by the Strike Committee.

Q. Was the offer accepted?

A. Officially by the Strike Committee; yes.

Q. Was a vote taken?

A. A vote was taken.

Q. Who took the vote?

A. The Strike Committee.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Q. Did you vote?

A. No; the Chairman doesn't vote.

Q. Were you in favor of accepting it?

A. I believe at that time I was.

Q. There is no question about that, is there?

A. I don't think so. I didn't give it much thought. [5786] We took anything we could get at that time for nothing.

Q. Did you speak before the Strike Committee?

A. At that time?

Q. Yes.

A. No. They used to kind of hold me down. I was the Chairman.

Q. Even at that time? A. What?

Q. Skip it. Did you advocate the acceptance of the offer made by Sam Darcy, Lawrence Ross, and possibly Elmer Hanoff?

A. I don't specifically remember. I think that at that time if I was asked was I in favor of it my answer possibly would be "Yes."

Q. Was your recollection better at the last hearing than it is now?

A. I am only human after all.

Q. You are what?

A. I think my recollection was better two years ago than it is now.

Q. Did you testify at the last hearing, in answer to this question—strike that and I will put it this way. Was this question asked you at the last hearing: "Did you advocate the acceptance of that offer to the members of the Strike Committee?"

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

A. I think such a question was asked. [5787]

Q. Did you reply:

“Certainly I advocated that, and also the other paper.”

A. If the record shows that I said it.

Q. The record does so show.

A. Then I said it.

Q. Is it true?

A. Yes. I might not remember it now, but that would be my position at that time. I mentioned the other paper too.

Q. I haven't asked you about the other paper. I asked you about the Western Worker.

Presiding Inspector: Don't scold the witness.

Mr. Del Guercio: Sir?

Presiding Inspector: Don't scold him.

Mr. Del Guercio: He couldn't be scolded by me.

I am just a—well, I am not a “big shot”. [5788]

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. Now, the Western Worker then did become the organ of the Strike Committee after you accepted the offer? A. No, it didn't.

Q. It printed a bulletin for you?

A. A—

Q. (Interposing) For the Strike Committee?

A. The Western Worker kept on publishing in its usual form. We had a full, one-single sheet, “Strike Bulletin” it said on the top, “ILA Strike Bulletin”, “Donated by the Western Worker” underneath it.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Q. Did it also say "Western Worker, official organ of the Communist Party"?

A. I don't think it did.

Q. Huh? A. No.

Q. Would you say it didn't?

A. I would say it didn't.

Q. Did you subscribe to the Western Worker at that time? A. No.

Q. Huh? A. No. I read it.

Q. Did your office—or did you have an office then? A. No; had no office. [5789]

Q. Now, you said that if Roy Hudson spoke in San Francisco at any time during the 1934 strike you would know about it?

A. I never said that.

Q. What did you say?

A. I said, if he spoke before any sizeable gathering on the strike in 1934 I would know about it.

Q. Do you know where Eagle's Hall is?

A. Yes.

Q. Where is it?

A. Golden Gate Avenue. We meet there every Monday night, my own Union.

Q. Is that a sizeable hall?

A. It holds about 2200 people.

Q. That would be one of the places then you would know if Roy Hudson spoke?

A. I said a "sizeable gathering". You can have a big hall but few people in it.

Q. Oh, the gathering too now. There must have been a sizeable gathering and there must have been

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

a sizeable hall for you to have known where Roy Hudson spoke at any time during the 1934 strike?

A. In connection with the strike. That was the question you asked me before.

Q. Yes. Now, as a matter of fact, you know that Roy Hudson spoke at the Golden Gate—at the Eagle's Hall [5790] Golden Gate Avenue, San Francisco, on July 2nd, 1934 and advocated a general strike? A. Who was he talking to?

Q. I will ask you that.

A. I don't know. Never heard of the meeting.

Q. Huh?

A. I don't know. It's news to me.

Q. News to you? A. Yes.

Q. And you were active in the 1934 strike?

A. I had a little to do with.

Q. If the Western Worker for July 16, 1934 printed the speech of Roy Hudson, made on the date I mentioned, you would know about it, wouldn't you? A. No.

Q. Huh? A. No. Why would I?

Q. Why wouldn't you?

A. I don't know, but I don't.

Q. You still want this Court to believe that you didn't know or hear about Roy Hudson during the 1934 strike? A. Definitely didn't.

Q. And that the first time you met him was or heard about him—well, you heard about him before. But the first time you met him was in 1936, was it?

A. I can't help what the Court believes. That's the [5791] truth.



(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Q. Huh?

A. And I certainly want the Court to believe it. We were holding meetings at that time. The Civic Auditorium wasn't big enough for us. We needed a little more room than that had.

Q. Was the Eagle's Hall?

A. No, sir. That wasn't big enough to hold our local membership meeting. We overflowed out of that all over the street.

Q. Let us stay with Roy Hudson for a little while without meandering. I believe you testified at the last hearing that you saw membership books in the Marine Workers Industrial Union, did you not?

A. Yes.

Q. You know what they look like?

A. Yes. I saw one in the last hearing.

Q. Let me show you a membership book in the Marine Workers Industrial Union. Did you ever see similar books? A. Yes.

Q. Is that the kind of books you saw while you were soliciting members for the Marine Workers Industrial Union?

A. I think that's the kind of books they—no, they weren't giving out books at the time I was taking members up there or sailors up there. They didn't give them books. [5792]

Q. But you can say, can you not, that this is the official book of the Marine Workers Industrial Union? A. As far as I know it is.

Q. And who signed—or, when did you see these books, Mr. Bridges?

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

A. Oh, I saw them at that time on the waterfront.

Q. Who were they signed by?

A. I don't know.

Q. Huh? A. I don't remember.

Q. Is it possible that they were signed by Roy Hudson?

A. It is possible. It is possible.

Q. Is it possible that you saw Marine Workers Industrial Membership books in 1934 signed by R. B. Hudson?

A. If he was signing them at that time it is possible.

Mr. Del Guercio: I will offer this book in evidence, if your Honor please, as Government's Exhibit next in order.

The Witness: You must understand that in 1934, if you took a walk along the waterfront you would be stopped on every block and somebody would ask you to dig up your union book and I have done as much asking as anybody.

Presiding Inspector: I will take it.

Mr. Gladstein: I still don't think that the proper foundation has been laid for its introduction in evidence.

Presiding Inspector: He said that he recognizes it, not necessarily at that time. But that was a book of the [5793] Marine Workers Industrial Union.

(The book referred to was received in evi-

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

dence and marked Government's Exhibit No. 276.)

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. You knew at that time that the Marine Workers Industrial Union was affiliated with the Trade Union Unity League, did you not?

A. I'm not sure that I did or give it much thought either.

Q. You read the Waterfront Worker, didn't you? A. Yes.

Q. Huh? A. Yes.

Q. Well now, having read—having in mind that you read the Waterfront Worker would you say that you knew at that time that the Marine Workers Industrial Union was affiliated with the Trade Union Unity League?

A. I said it's possible. I am not sure of it now.

Q. Was it ever printed in the Waterfront Worker that the Marine Workers Industrial Union was affiliated with the Trade Union Unity League?

A. I don't know.

Q. Well, you printed the Waterfront Worker, didn't you? You were one of the editors, you say?

A. I can't remember. I doubt it. At the time we [5794] were putting it out I don't know if we did or not.

Q. And if I showed you a copy of the Waterfront Worker during the time that you were putting it out, wherein it was stated that the Marine Workers Industrial Union was affiliated with the Trade

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Union Unity League, would that refresh your memory?

A. Possibly it would. I wouldn't deny it. We were kind of proud of the paper.

Q. And you would remember then that you knew at that time that the Marine Workers Industrial Union was affiliated with the Trade Union Unity League?

A. No. I would remember that we printed it in the Waterfront Worker.

Q. Did you print anything in there that wasn't true?

A. No, not as much as we could do to stop it. We printed a few things that were not true.

Q. Did you print lies?

A. In some cases that even happened. It wasn't exactly our fault. We used to print the material as it was sent in and sometimes it turned out that one particular person wanted to take a rib at somebody else, and he might have actually not told the truth. When we found those things we corrected it in the next issue.

Q. Did you print falsehoods in the Waterfront Worker?

A. In the way I stated it actually happened.

[5795]

Q. And you caused them to be printed?

A. No.

Q. Mimeographed?

A. They way I stated: That we were not able to check the complete truthfulness of every story.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

When it did happen that some errors appeared in a story it would be corrected in the next issue, which, after all, is something that is pretty difficult to have that done in any newspaper.

Q. Was the Waterfront Worker a newspaper?

A. Yes.

Q. Was it registered as a newspaper?

A. Well, it might not be in the technical sense. It was a waterfront newspaper.

Q. Was it registered in the Post Office?

A. No. I didn't know that was a requirement of a newspaper.

Q. Was it sent through the mails?

A. Yes.

Q. As what?

A. As the Waterfront Worker.

Q. As a newspaper?

Presiding Inspector: I think he means at newspaper rates.

The Witness: Oh, no. Oh, no. We mailed them in the regular style.

Mr. Del Guercio: We have introduced a number of these [5796] Waterfront Workers in evidence here, your Honor.

Presiding Inspector: Yes, I think you have.

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. Let me show you Government's Exhibit 205, which is an issue of the Waterfront Worker for July, 1933. That's the time you had a hand in the Waterfront Worker, is it not? A. No.

Q. Huh? A. No.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Q. When did you begin? A. Later.

Q. Later? A. Yes.

Q. Did you testify at the last hearing in 1939 that you became associated with the Waterfront Worker in 1932?

A. I think I made that statement.

Q. Huh? A. Yes.

Q. Was that correct?

A. No, I don't think it was.

Q. It wasn't true?

A. I have found out since that that was an incorrect date. I said in the last hearing—I said we became associated with it in September or October, 1932. At the same time I said I could check the date and check the issues. [5797]

Q. Well now, what have you checked?

A. As a matter of fact, the Waterfront Worker didn't start until June, 1933. So I was just a year out, and we started operating it around September or October of 1933.

Q. So that this group of longshoremen that you have been talking about had no connection with the Waterfront Worker in July, 1933?

A. No. I think it went out of business around July, '33.

Q. The Waterfront Worker—

A. (Interposing) Yes.

Q. (Continuing): —went out of business in July, 1933? A. Yes.

Q. What issue is this, Government's Exhibit 205?

A. The first issue we put out changed the name



(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

here. It said, "Issued by a group of ILA long-shoremen".

Q. Now, this is Government's Exhibit 205. You will note it is for July, 1933. A. Yes.

Q. And on the masthead, notwithstanding what you have said, it says "Issued by a group of long-shoremen". Now, regardless of the checking that you have done you were connected or associated with the Waterfront Worker in July of 1933, weren't you? A. No.

Q. Huh? [5798] A. No.

Q. Well, to what group of longshoremen does this refer to in the July, 1933 issue of the Waterfront Worker?

A. I think there was a group of seamen-long-shoremen.

Q. Huh?

A. I think there was a group of seamen-long-shoremen, if not in the Marine Workers Industrial Union possibly closely affiliated. It was not our group.

Q. You were not one of them?

A. No. When we took it over and put it out we changed it, and if you will look through some of those issues you will find, I think, maybe some statement to the effect that it was going to be discontinued for lack of funds or something.

Q. Now, in this same issue, Government's Exhibit 205, appears this, notwithstanding what you have testified to, on page 6 in the bottom of the last column: "As in the past, the Marine Workers In-

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

dustrial Union has given us their cooperation and help in issuing this paper. The next issue of the Waterfront Worker will contain the report of the Unity Convention being held in New York July 16, 17 and 18".

Well now, Mr. Bridges, doesn't that refresh your recollection a little bit?      A. No.

Q. Huh? [5799]

A. No. It's fresh enough.

Q. Now, to whom did they refer? What did this refer to: "As in the past, the Marine Workers Industrial Union has given us their cooperation and help in issuing this paper"? What were they talking about?      A. I don't know.

Q. "You don't know?"      A. No.

Q. Huh?      A. No.

Q. What checking did you do between the last hearing and this hearing with reference to the——

A. (Interposing) In the——

Q. (Continuing): ——with reference to the time you became connected with the Waterfront Worker?

A. In the last hearing I promised that I would try to search and get all the old issues of the Waterfront Worker that I could. I was unable to do that. I never had any old issues. These are the first time I have seen issues like this since 1933 or 1934, but as soon as I saw them I knew the difference because I remember when the change-over was made, what the change-over was, and that is that it was definitely put out by a group of union longshoremen. One of the arguments against the paper and

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

why it wasn't successful was that it was not being put out by the union longshoremen on the waterfront. [5800] and complaints were made that it was disrupting or splitting the union. And we agreed with those complaints. I was one of the ones that raised it. And when we started to put it out, either in September or October, 1933, after it had been out of business a couple of months, we stated that "This is a new Waterfront Worker being put out by a group of ILA union longshoremen to build the ILA".

Q. Well, let's see how correct you are, Mr. Bridges. I have in my hand here again this Government's Exhibit No. 205. I am reading now the first article that appears on the front page below the masthead there, below this "Issued by a group of longshoremen".

"What Does 'The News Letter' Mean?"

"Like the rest of the stevedores we have signed up in the I.L.A. and paid the 50c. Like the rest of the stevedores we are fed up with the B.B. and have organized to finally smash it. It is now up to us to make the new union a real fighting weapon of the stevedores able and ready to win better wages and working conditions and to protect all our interests. To do this we ourselves must take control of our organization. The 'News Letter' issued by a self appointed executive board has convinced us that we must start doing this immediately. What does this letter contain? And what does it mean to us?"

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Do you want to change your testimony now, Mr. Bridges?

A. Not at all. Anybody that is familiar with the [5801] waterfront can just judging by that terminology alone—could see what complaint we had.

Q. You don't want to change it yet?

A. "Stevedore" is a word never used on the waterfront by anybody who works down there or everybody down there. That's one of the complaints we had. Any longshoremen any length of time on the waterfront reading that alone, that paragraph that you just read, would know that it was never put out or written by a longshoreman.

Q. Let me show you, then, Government's Exhibit No. 204, which is the June issue, June, 1933 issue of the Waterfront Worker, and on the masthead appears this—"This paper is issued by a group of organized longshoremen. We acknowledge the help given us by the M.W.I.U.". Does that help you refresh your memory? A. Sure it does.

Q. Huh? A. It sure does.

Q. Do you now want to—

A. (Interposing) Sure! Some of the complaints we were raising began to work on these fellows and instead of putting the bulletin out in the name of the M.W.I.U. they began to put it out in the name of a group of longshoremen, but they still couldn't make a job of it.

Q. Now, your testimony was that you took over

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

the [5802] Waterfront Worker after the Marine Workers Industrial Union couldn't make a go of it?

A. That's right.

Q. Huh? A. That's right.

Q. Nobody else had taken it over between that time and the time you had it? A. No.

Q. Did they? A. No, no.

Q. No group of longshoremen? A. No.

Q. Had taken it over before your group of longshoremen had taken it over, had they?

A. Not that I know of.

Q. Huh?

A. Not that I know of. My best recollection is that we took it over at the time of the October strike in 1933 and it had been out of business for a couple of months then. Now, if you have enough issues there you can follow them right down the line and see the issue. If you have got all the issues you will see the issue in there, the first issue we put out, where we explained what we were doing: That we were taking the paper over and it was going to be put out by a group of organized union longshoremen. Now, if you have [5803] got them all you have got that one, too.

Q. You would be surprised what we have got. You will get some more surprises before it is over. Now, I have here—excuse me, your Honor, for the remark. It was not said with any offense.

Now, I have here the August 15, 1933 issue of the Waterfront Worker. A. Yes.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Q. Did you have anything to do with it at that time?

A. The only way I can go by is if the masthead changed.

Q. Huh?

A. That is the only thing I can go by.

Q. Haven't you checked that between your testimony at the last hearing and your testimony now?

A. No. I have no way to positively check it. I have checked it the best way I was able to. But the best thing to go by is when the name on the masthead changed and that indicated a change in ownership.

Q. Would you say that you had nothing to do with it in August, 1933?

A. To the best of my recollection I did not.

Q. Let me show you this copy of the Waterfront Worker for—

A. (Interposing) No, we had nothing to do with it then. [5804]

Q. Huh?

A. We had nothing to do with it then.

Q. Let me call your attention here to the masthead here "Issued by a group of Longshoremen with the cooperation of the Marine Workers Industrial Union". Now, my voice is getting a little hoarse. Would you mind reading that article on the front page. [5805]

A. The article is headed "Tonight"—the article is headed "For the I.L.A. Meeting Tonight".

"Tonight the I.L.A. meets for the second time



(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

since its beginning here two months ago. What has the I.L.A. done for us in this two months? What has been done to immediately better the conditions on the waterfront?

"The great ballyhoo Lee Holman and Co. made about breaking the B.B. has petered out into a farce. The B.B. is still here and victimizing men on the front every day. What is the present leadership of the I.L.A. doing about it? Nothing! What has happened to the promises of an Dollar a hour, and a Dollar and a half overtime and all the other rosy promises??? Nobody hears any more of them. In Fact, some stevedores are now heard to ask: 'What has happened to the I.L.A., has it given up?'

"Why has the I.L.A. not become the fighting organization we wanted on the front? Because we have never taken affairs into our own hands. We have from the first let everything in the hands of a few individuals we know little about.

"Tonight we must make the break. We must take the organization into our own hands. The rank and file must run and control the I.L.A. Tonight we must attend the meeting and do the following:

"1.) Elect our own Chairman . . . .

"2.) Elect a complete slate of our own officials, men from the Waterfront whom we know well.

[5806]

"3.) Elect an Executive Board of about 24, so that the organization will remain in our own hands and be kept from the control of a few officials. This

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Executive Board must be representative of the various docks.

"4.) Begin the building of dock committees, so that we can have the Union right on the job, and use it on the job.

"5.) Wide representation from the rank and file must be gotten at all conferences.

"6.) We must take immediate steps to develop action against the B.B.

"Only by carrying out immediately this steps can we protect our interests on the waterfront.

"Fellow Steredores: Let us take things in our own hands tonight!

"For Complete Rank and File Control in the I.L.A.!!

"For Immediate Organized Action Against the B.B.!!"

Q. Well, you recall your testimony here about this Albion Hall group? A. Yes.

Q. Huh? A. Yes.

Q. Now, having in mind your testimony regarding the Albion Hall group and this article that you have just read, would you say that you weren't connected with the Waterfront Worker at that time?

[5807]

A. Since reading the article now I am positive. And I can say why.

Mr. Del Guercio: I will offer—

The Witness (Interposing): We put out a leaflet along the same line.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Mr. Del Guercio: Wait a minute! I didn't ask you yet.

I will offer this Waterfront Worker for August 15, 1933, in evidence.

Presiding Inspector: It may be received.

(The document referred to was received in evidence and marked Government's Exhibit No. 280.)

# GOVERNMENT'S EXHIBIT No. 280

## WATERFRONT WORKER (Cut)

Issued by: A group of longshoremen with the cooperation of the Marine Workers Industrial Union.

Vol. 1 No. 9 Waterfront Worker August 15, '33

## FOR THE I. L. A. MEETING TONIGHT.

Tonight the I.L.A. meets for the second time since its beginning here two months ago. What has the I.L.A. done for us in this t w o months? What has been done to immediately better the conditions on the Waterfront?

The great ballyhoo Lee Holman and Co. made about "breaking the B.B. has petered out into a farce. The B. B. is still here and victimizing men on the front every day. What is the present leadership of the I.L.A. doing about it? Nothing! What has happened to the promises of an Dollar a hour, and a Dollar and a half overtime and all the other rosy promises? ? ? Nobody hears any more of them. In Fact, some stevedores are now

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Government's Exhibit No. 280—(Continued.)

heard to ask: "What has happened to the I.L.A.? Has it given up?"

Why has the I.L.A. not become the fighting organization we wanted on the front? Because we have never taken affairs into our own hands. We have from the first let everything in the hands of a few individuals we know little about.

Tonight we must make the break. We must take the organization into our own hands. The rank and file must run and control the I.L.A. Tonight we must attend the meeting and do the following:

- 1.) Elect our own Chairman.
- 2.) Elect a complete slate of our own officials, men from the Waterfront whom we knew well.
- 3.) Elect an Executive Board of about 24, so that the organization will remain in our own hands and be kept from the control of a few officials. This Executive Board must be representative of the various docks.
- 4.) Begin the building of dock committees, so that we can have the Union right on the job, and use it on the job.
- 5.) Wide representation from the rank and file must be gotten at all conferences.
- 6.) We must take immediate steps to develop action against the B.B.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Government's Exhibit No. 280—(Continued.)

Only by carrying out immediately this steps can we protect our interests on the Waterfront.

Fellow Stevedores: Let us take things in our own hands tonight!

"For Complete Rank and File Control in the I.L.A.!!"

"For Immediate Organized Action Against the B.B.!!"

\* \* \* \* \*

Wick tries hard . . . .

Wicks, the Blue Book dues collector had a confab with Stratmeyer the Supt. of McCormic S. S. Co last week, in regards to pulling men off the job who werenot paying up in the B.B. After 15 minutes of pushing breeze between them, Stratmeyer said to Wicks: "If they pay, alright, but if they do not, leave them alone, as I do not want new men coming in this dock as we have a tremendousturnover in Labor."

\* \* \* \* \*

The Marine Workers Industrial Union wishes to announce a Dance & Entertainment, Saturday Aug. 26, 8.P.M. at 1223 Fillmore Admission 25c Unemployed 5c.

\* \* \* \* \*

Not a Cent More into the B.B. Racket

Page 2

Waterfront Worker

August 15 '33

EXTRACTS FROM THE CODE FOR  
LONGSHOREMEN DRAWN

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Government's Exhibit No. 280—(Continued.)

## UP BY THE MARINE WORKERS INDUSTRIAL UNION

While 36 hours shall constitute a week's work there must be a guaranteed minimum of 30 hours a week, 40 weeks a year. The Government and industry shall guarantee this minimum of 40 weeks; all workers getting less than 40 weeks shall receive the difference between their actual earnings and the minimum wage from Unemployment Insurance, funds for which shall be raised by a 1c tax on every hundred pounds of freight; and from funds appropriated for the Jones\*White Act.

\* \* \* \* \*

Wages shall be adjusted regularly as prices rise so that there will be no lowering of the living standards due to inflation. There shall be no gang system of engagement but a roto system of hiring to be controlled by a committee of longshoremen.

\* \* \* \* \*

Double straight time shall be paid for the following holidays: New Year's Day, Lincoln's Birthday, Washington's Birthday, Thanksgiving Day, Memorial Day, Independence Day, Labor Day, Columbus Day, Armistice Day and Christmas. When the above holidays fall on Sunday the overtime rates shall apply to the following day. All workers to be given time off with pay to vote in all elections.

\* \* \* \* \*

Under no conditions shall seamen drive wenches.

\* \* \* \* \*



(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Government's Exhibit No. 280—(Continued.)

When men are ordered out to work and no work is provided the men shall be paid four (4) hours at the prevailing rates.

\* \* \* \* \*

In order to create more jobs the minimum gang for general cargo shall not be less than 22 men, with corresponding increases for all other types of cargo. The local Union and Dock committees shall determine the size of gangs.

\* \* \* \* \*

To insure the health of the men there shall be one relief man on the forward and one on the after part of the ship.

The longshoremen shall have the right to join any union they see fit. The right to strike when their demands are not otherwise granted. We demand that provisions be made for the recognition of elected committees of the longshoremen.

Continued on next column.

# EXTRACTS FROM THE CODE FOR SEAMEN DRAWN UP BY THE MARINE WORKERS INDUSTRIAL UNION

On all vessels carrying dangerous, inflammable and obnoxious cargo (oil tankers, sulphur, boats, etc) an additional increase of 20% in wages shall be given.

\* \* \* \* \*

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Government's Exhibit No. 280—(Continued.)

Full wages shall be paid for every member of the crew and there shall be a complete abolition of the workaway system.

\* \* \* \* \*

Food shall be of adequate quality and quantity suitable to climate and weather conditions and subject to inspection of ships' committee.

\* \* \* \* \*

Fink Halls and shipping masters shall be abolished and a central shipping agency with rotary system of engagement under control of elected committees of seamen shall be instituted.

\* \* \* \* \*

The workers shall have the right to belong to any union of their own choosing and the right to strike whenever the workers' demands are not otherwise granted. As a means of providing additional work for seamen the code shall include the recommendation of definite trade relations between the USA and the Soviet Union.

\* \* \* \* \*

The Seamen's code shall provide recognition of democratically elected Committees of the Seamen representative of all departments on a vessel.

\* \* \* \* \*

These ship committees to be recognized by the employers in the enforcement of wages, hours, discharges and conditions of labor contained in the above provisions and any other problems that may arise.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Government's Exhibit No. 280—(Continued.)

\* \* \* \* \*

Continued from column 1.

These dock committees to be recognized by the employers in the enforcement of wages and conditions of labor contained in this code and in any other problems that might arise. In all conferences the longshoremen shall be represented by committees elected by and from the ranks of the longshoremen.

\* \* \* \* \*

Page 3      Waterfront Worker      August 15 '33

Things are daily happening on the Front. The waterfront is going to be astir from now on. Difference of opinion is going to be common. Fight it out in the Waterfront Worker.

Write to the Waterfront Worker. 3470-19th St.  
The Mail Bag

**HOLMAN & CO. AND THE B.B.**

Dear Editor:

On August 7th a stevedore employed by the Matson S.S. Co. was ordered off Pier 32 by Capt. Russel and instructed not to return until he had paid up in the Blue Book. A demand was made upon Lee Holman and his associates by a number of interested stevedores that some action be taken, and support given to men who are being knocked off on account of not paying dues in the B. B.

Lee Holman's reply to this was for workers not

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Government's Exhibit No. 280.—(Continued.)

to pay their dues in the B. B. That he would take the matter up with Rayn and Dept. of Justice. Stevedores are daily becoming more impatient with Holman and his policy of watchful waiting.

A real leader would declare his policy so the workers would know what course to follow. The Matson Co. and other shipowners, if not curbed will knock off individually, men who refuse to pay up in the B. B. Stevedores will be intimidated and forced to join the Blue Book.

It is now almost two months since Lee Holman appeared on the Waterfront and signed up men in the I.L.A., Men who signed up were promised a militant union: A union that would fight for their interests. When it comes to fighting for the interests of the workers, Lee Holman can't make a decision without his shadow, McNulty who has not been active on the Waterfront for many years.

Striking workers in the Eastern industrial belt during the past few months have had to develop leaders from the rank and file. Our way out is the same.

It is coming clear that militant and intelligent leadership cannot be expected from the old line AFL leaders and politicians.

#### A Waterfront Worker.

Editors Note: The writer shows a tendency to depend on a few "leaders". The sooner we forget about individual leaders and depend on ourselves, the better.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Government's Exhibit No. 280—(Continued.)

**WHEN TWO OF A KIND BEATS A  
FULL HOUSE****Fellow Stevedores & Editor:**

We all know how to play poker, but we don't all know how a membership meeting in our union should be carried out. I witnessed that at our first meeting in the Labor Temple on July 27th.

Once in a great while those of us who play poker see a deal where two of a kind beats a full house by bluffing. If the full house doesn't call the two of a kind, the full house loses. That is just what happened at our meeting.

We had a full house at the Labor Temple that night—Lee Holman and Tom Hern were the two of a kind. They bluffed and got away with it. Why didn't we call their bluff? Was it because they had two gunmen at the door or didn't we know how to carry out our meeting? I think we did not know how to carry out our meeting and hope that the Editor of the Waterfront Workers will explain in the next issue of the paper how a Union meeting should go about so the two of a kind won't have a chance of bluffing a full house again.

Dock Walloper.

**WATER CANS AND RATS**

The water cans which the men use to drink from on pier 40 (McCormick) are old and rusted, and filthy with slime and scum. The Company is too busy piling up profits to have the cans scalded out.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Government's Exhibit No. 280—(Continued.)

or replaced with new ones. The cans are left in the hold at sea partly filled with water and as the holds are infested with rats it is not an uncommon occurrence to find one or more of them drowned when the hatches are opened. It is time to take serious notice of this condition & take immediate active steps to remedy it. Unless something is done we can expect a virulent epidemic to set in.

\* \* \*

Page 4. Waterfront Worker August 15, '33

### UNDER BELOW HUNGRY GUS AGAIN

By a correspondent

Recently on Pier 22 the gang was handling sugar—26 sacks on a flat ton (one ton)—Hungry Gus seeing that they could pull that hollered for 25 sacks.

Looks like if the gang don't take action soon, Hungry Gus's ambition will bellow for 30 sacks next.

### TRITTON IN TROUBLE

By a correspondent

One of the McCormicks East Coast boats was working all night at Pier 40. Tom Tritton had a gang there with several more windbags like himself shouting and banging things trying to outnoise every thing else.

The ship had a high deckloas of lumber which they were discharging. The winch driver not able



(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Government's Exhibit No. 280—(Continued.)

to see, sent a load of lumber crashing into a warehouse, tearing everything away before it glass and all. It was a grand spectacle to behold, to see the sling of lumber sailing thru the air. The Walker came along and sent Tritton home with his gang.

### SAFETY SECOND

By a correspondent

In the SS Brookings and other vessels of the McCormick Line there are but two ladders for the four hatches—no bulkhead between No. 1 and No. 2 or between No. 3 & No. 4.

The shipowners have conceived this idea as a way to save a little steel and weight regardless of their jeopardizing the lives of the men who are piling up their enormous profits.

When a vessel arrives at it's terminus the exit to the ladder in the adjoining hatch is blocked off with lumber or other cargo. In case of fire or of the ship taking a heavy list, the men working below would have little chance for escape—being caught like rats in a trap.

\* \* \*

### INTERNATIONAL NEWS

Stockholm, Aug. 10.—A strike of 90 sailors and 400 recruits in a barracks at the Swedish naval base at Karlskrona, in protest against bad food, was followed almost immediately by a strike of 800 more sailors in another barracks.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Government's Exhibit No. 280—(Continued.)

All refused to drill until better food was guaranteed. The strike was won.

\* \* \*

New York. Aug. 6—A cable from the International Seamen's and Harbor Workers' Union yesterday announcing that Polish seamen had gone out on strike and calling on the Marine Workers' Industrial Union to stop all Polish liners in port, was followed by a cable story announcing that the strikers had won all demands and gone back to work.

The I. S. H., which is working illegally in Poland, has succeeded through leading a series of militant strikes in isolating the strike-breaking reformists and building democratically elected rank and file committees among the Polish seamen which have carried through many successful strikes.

\* \* \*

Canton, China. Aug. 7—A boycott of the British owned China Navigation Company, biggest shipping firm in China, by striking seamen of Canton has completely tied up the company's docks. Picketing is so successful that the company's ships are not calling at Canton. Over \$2,000,000 worth of goods is deteriorating in the warehouses.

\* \* \*

### NEWS FROM OTHER PORTS

A longshoreman from Phila reports that the I.L.A. officials gave a picnic in Phila. and drained the treasury of \$5000.00. Ryans henchmen were the ones who had the picnic.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Government's Exhibit No. 280—(Continued.)

\* \* \*

Santiago, Chile. Aug. 8 All the crews on the ships of the South American Steamship Company (U.S.) went on strike here today demanding a 25 percent rise in wages.

\* \* \*

The Sydney M Hauptman of the McCormick Line came into Frisco with her crew 100 per cent organized into the Marine Workers Industrial Union.

\* \* \*

Send your material for the next Waterfront Worker in early.

Page 5      Waterfront Worker      August 15 '33

### AT LAST WE MEET

By a correspondent

With Leo Holman presiding the long delayed meeting of I. L. A. came to order July 27 at 8 P.M. & so to assure himself that said order would be maintained, Holman called upon S.F. police for help by having two officers stationed within the door, and not outside where they belonged as a member of the meeting pointed out from the start.

This motion however met with no approval from the chair for a mighty good reason as I saw a few minutes later. A member seconded the motion that a chairman be elected from the floor as suggested by the Waterfront Worker. Holman had him removed by the cops. Although I do not know the men myself, I ascertained that he has been working on the front for years and is well known.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Government's Exhibit No. 280—(Continued.)

If such high hat methods are going to be used against any one who dares to voice an opinion contrary to the ideas of Holman I foresee a quick end to the enthusiasm and interest in the I.L.A. that now prevails on the front.

Another feature of the meeting that I have heard discussed with much ill feeling was the way that the two delegates for the Portland Convention were selected—(certainly not elected) Holman was nominated by T. Hern to present the code at Portland and the latter was in turn nominated by Holman in the event that he (Holman) was unable to go. Both motions were rapidly carried—steamrollered. I should say, in short order, without the customary question being put. I noticed at least four members who tried to get the floor at this time which was their absolute right, by all the rules of order, but the floor was denied to all for fear that the motion may have been exposed by debate and not carried. Holman was certainly afraid that some member would move that a delegate be elected from the rank and file, but by this method Holman secured the job for himself and T. Hern in face of a great deal of protest.

Viewed from the two main angles, wages and hours, the proposed code was all that could be desired. The dimensions of the loads was another matter. 20 cases of oil, 6 drums of oil & asphaltum, 60 & 40 cases of canned goods, etc. with only 8 men in the hold is no reduction on any dock except Matson

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Government's Exhibit No. 280—(Continued.)

or Swayne & Hoyt. Again no discussion was allowed nor did I hear the question of a list system with an accompanying flat rate for hour mentioned. The latter method found much favor among men on the front.

After waiting patiently, and being confident that something would be done, when hearing McNulty denounce the Blue Book and being told how the San Pedro men had run Scabby Peterson out, imagine my surprise whereupon it was moved that every man on the Waterfront who is a member of the ILA refuse to pay dues to the B.B. and said motion was seconded by three or four different members and also meeting with undisguised approval of the majority of the members present, the chairman had the adacity to adjourn the meeting thus sidetracking one of the most important issues on the front today. Why was this important issue sidetracked? It was also too bad that the chair dared not to have the police throw out the member making this motion and so had to resort to the adjournment as a last resort. I gave the chair credit for quick thinking.

In conclusion I would urge all longshoremen attending the next meeting to see that the chair allows a member to voice an opinion from the floor without his being thrown out, and so let all of us on the front have a say in such matters as 1. How big shall the loads be. 2. Who shall represent us at the conference. 3. How shall we combat the black-listing tactics of the Blue Book.



(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Government's Exhibit No. 280—(Continued.)

## N R A COMES TO PIER 40

By a correspondent

Recently, while working on a McCormick vessel, the discharging load was three half rolls of new sprint paper on a board sling, making a hoist of some twenty one hundred pounds to a lift.

With his usual majestic display of authority, the dock captain came over to the hatch and ordered the size of the loads to be increased to six rolls.

Now the question arises, considering the fact that the McCormick Line is the first outfit on the front to display the NRA Blue Eagle flag,—is this what Roosevelt had in mind when he spoke so encouragingly to us of the New Deal.

\* \* \*

## WRITE FOR THE WATERFRONT WORKER

Page 6

Waterfront Worker

August 15 '33

IN A PIG'S EYE!

## WATERFRONT WORKER

3470-19th Street

SAN FRANCISCO

The Sales Tax . . .

Rolph's veto of the income tax leaves no doubt the policy of the state government is to exempt the rich from taxation. As a matter of fact the  $2\frac{1}{2}\%$  tax is closer to 7%. The average purchase that working class housewives make is far less than 59 cents



(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Government's Exhibit No. 280—(Continued.)

Probably 3 pennies are drawn out of a worker thru 15 and 20 cent purchases for every 59 cents spent. The tax is the same as if the workers wages were cut, and it was quite fitting that it began on the very day when the Blue Eagle policy, supposedly a symbol of more wages went into effect. The tax is on top of increases in prices of products most commonly consumed by workers, averaging already at least 20%. As a matter of fact the NRA ballyhoo to date has only served as an excuse to increase prices and impose such taxes.

It is in the interest of the stevedores as well as all other workers to organize a fight against this tax scheme. This must not be confused with the move of a group of large merchants who have announced that they will initiate a referendum for repeal. Such a referendum takes two years to carry thru. This would be useless as the law is only a two years measure. This fight is part of the struggle against the high cost of living, and goes hand in hand with the chief fight, which is for increases in wages, and against the NRA cuts.

\* \* \*

The B.B. in Pedro.

(by a correspondent.)

Stein, former "Iron Man" of the Blue Book got shown up in Pedro. He was trying to cash in on the sentiment for organization created there.

In the Fink Hall alley one of the longshoremen

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Government's Exhibit No. 280—(Continued.)  
accused him of collecting dues with blackjack in one pocket and gun in the other.

"And I'll bet you have a gun in your pocket right now" said the Steve.

This was proven to be true. So Stein slunk out of the alley . . .

\* \* \*

NOT A CENT MORE INTO THE B.B. RACKET

[Endorsed]: Filed June 2, 1942.

Mr. Del Guercio: I would like permission to withdraw it and substitute a photostatic copy.

Presiding Inspector: Certainly.

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. Who were the editors of the Waterfront Worker in 1933 and particularly in June, July and August? A. I don't know.

Q. Huh? A. I don't know.

Q. Who were the editors of the Waterfront Worker when you took it over?

A. What do you mean by an "editor"?

Q. One who edits a paper, I guess. [5808]

A. Well, I know editors and editors. I go out here and I see a man sitting behind a desk in a big office. He's an editor. This type of paper, what you might call an "editor" was possibly anybody who contributed an article. I don't know of any editors

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges:)

in the true sense. The paper was handled by a group of people who contributed the material for it.

Q. There was a group? A. Yes.

Q. A group of what? A. Longshoremen.

Q. And you were one of them?

A. Oh, yes.

Q. Huh? A. Yes.

Q. Now, when did that group—how did they come about to edit or to get out the Waterfront Worker-

A. We just—one of the days that we were standing around on the waterfront waiting for some work that didn't come along, why, just standing there on the curbstone on the sidewalk discussing it, we got the bright idea that we could do a better job with those fellows than they had been able to do.

Q. Than what fellows were able to do?

A. These fellows, this group of longshoremen.

[5809]

Q. Of the Marine Workers Industrial Union?

A. Oh, we suspected—since reading this I can tell you why. We suspected—

Q. (Interposing) Now, wait! Not the Marine Workers Industrial Union? It was this group of longshoremen, a group of longshoremen other than these?

A. We suspected that they were one and the same.

Q. When did your group that you are talking about get together and first conceive the idea of taking over the Waterfront Worker?

A. My best recollection is in October.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Q. October what? A. 1933.

Q. 1933? A. At the time—

Q. (Interposing): That is your best considered recollection?

A. Well, the reason I fix it is this: Because at that time we had a strike on the waterfront and we needed some kind of an organ or a paper or some type of literature to distribute to explain the issues and to prevent strikebreakers coming on to the waterfront, and we conceived the idea.

Q. "We", who do you mean by "we"?

A. Just a group of longshoremen; just the fellows that [5810] stood there every morning day in and day out.

Q. And who were they among that group besides yourself?

A. Oh, there was quite a few. I could name off a few names.

Q. Yes, if you please.

A. Schmidt was one.

Q. Henry Schmidt? A. Henry Schmidt.

Q. In 1933? A. I think so.

Q. You are sure of that?

A. Well, I heard his testimony here. But I am just giving you now my best recollection.

Q. I know you heard his testimony and I know you heard him testify that he had nothing to do with the Waterfront Worker until the early part of 1934 some time. A. I did.

Q. And notwithstanding that you say that he

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

was associated, connected with the Waterfront Worker in about, as you say, October 1933?

A. That was my recollection. Of course I could change it and say that it might have been '34, but I am trying to give my best recollection.

Q. Oh, I am sure. Sure.

A. Notwithstanding what Schmidt said. [5811]

Q. Now, who else?

A. I didn't say that Schmidt might have been it right from the start, but I certainly couple him up with it pretty close from the time we got started.

Q. Would you say that from the very beginning Mr. Schmidt was associated with the Waterfront Worker-

A. In my recollection he was there pretty close to the start.

Q. Now, who else?

A. Jack Shaw was another; John Schomaker.

Q. Jack who?

A. Jack Shaw. Schomaker was another.

Q. Is that John Schomaker? A. Yes.

Q. Right from the very beginning now?

A. Yes, or thereabouts. When you say "from the beginning" are you referring now to when the thing actually started?

Q. When your group, the group that you were connected with, took over the publication; if you call it "publication," of this Waterfront Worker?

A. It is pretty hard to nail that down when you understand the way the thing started. The thing



(Testimony of Harry Renfon Bridges.)

started in a loose way. It didn't start in an organized way.

Q. Look! I have already asked you how it started [5812] and you said a group of longshoremen got together on the curb. You mentioned "curb."

A. That's right.

Q. And you got started. Do you want to go into that again?

A. That is exactly the way it happened, but your idea of what I meant by a "group" is different from what my answer really is.

Q. What group is that that conceived the idea of taking over the Waterfront Worker?

A. Just a few men standing on the waterfront one morning.

Q. Who are they?

A. I am trying to tell you to the best of my memory.

Q. You mentioned Schmidt, I believe.

A. I did.

Q. Jack Shaw?

A. Jack Shaw was another.

Q. John Schomaker was another?

A. Yes, to the best of my recollection.

Q. Who else?

A. Let me get around to it. I am trying to separate those first few fellows as much as I can from the large number who later contributed.

Q. Let me do some separating for you. You tes-



(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

tified that there were only about eight or ten that were actively [5813] connected with the paper?

A. That I can remember.

Q. Give me the names of those eight or ten.

A. John Larson. It is pretty hard to remember some of them right now because of the way we used to know the fellows.

Q. They were the same fellows that were in this Albion Hall group that you have testified about?

A. No, no. Yes and no.

Q. Huh? A. Yes and no.

Q. Well, that's a good answer.

A. Well, I can explain it.

Q. Yes.

A. I can explain it. Many people contributed to the paper in the way of articles. Many people knew generally speaking, who was putting it out.

Q. Now, who now? A. Many people.

Q. Let's stay on that. You say many people knew who was putting it out? A. Yes.

Q. Let me ask you then who was putting it out?

A. Quite a number of longshoremen in the way that I have described.

Q. Now, let me have the names of those longshoremen [5814] that you say everybody knew; a lot of people *knew* were putting it out.

A. I am giving you the names to the best of my recollection. You first of all have got to understand the waterfront. You know this guy by the name of "Dutch" and this guy "Snowy" over here, and this guy is "Bill," and you have all kinds of nicknames

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

and you can recall them much better by their nicknames and by just looking at them.

Q. I would even accept the nicknames, if you will tell me.

A. That's what I am trying to think of.

Q. Well, give me them.

A. Well, it is not so easy. I can't recall many more. They are the ones that stand out most in my mind.

Q. And yet you were able to recall definitely that there were eight or ten associated actively in putting out the Waterfront Worker. Now, how did you know that?

A. When was that?

Q. In your testimony even as much as yesterday and this morning.

A. Oh, no.

Q. Do you forget what you testified to yesterday?

A. I haven't said that there were not eight or ten. You are asking me to name them.

Q. Do you refuse to name them?

A. No, I don't. I just have a little difficulty [5815] remembering all their names. After all, that's eight years ago and I just don't remember all their names.

Q. Is that the best you can do now, those that you have mentioned?

A. Off-hand, yes. I could possibly—as we go along, every time I think of one I will let you know.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Q. You will put up your hand?

A. Well, I can tell you or I can possibly do a little checking up and get you a few more. [5816]

Q. You testified, either yesterday or this morning—I don't remember which—that you employed seamen to distribute copies of the Waterfront Worker. Who employed the seamen?

A. Well, us fellows who were putting out the paper.

Q. "Us fellows who were putting out the paper?"

A. Yes; the same eight or ten.

Q. Who did the hiring, "us fellows all together?"

A. As a rule.

Q. Did you have—

A. (Interposing): I am just trying to think of the person we used to depend on to take care of that. There was nothing to it. They was always a few hundred seamen—

Q. (Interposing): Did you have anything to do with hiring the seamen to distribute it?

A. You bet; on occasions.

Q. You hired them yourself?

A. On occasions.

Q. You paid them 50 cents a day?

A. It wasn't done that way.

A. Huh?

A. You didn't pay them. You supplied them with the papers and then they sold them.

Q. At 50 cents a day.

A. They gave you back the money they had left over.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Q. Your testimony this morning was that you employed [5817] seamen at 50 cents a day.

A. That is still correct.

Q. To distribute the Waterfront Worker.

A. That is still correct.

Q. 50 cents a day?

A. That is still my testimony.

Q. That is still your testimony? A. Yes.

Q. You were a union man at that time?

A. Yes.

Q. Huh? A. Yes.

Q. You employed seamen at 50 cents a day to work, to distribute papers for you?

A. Well, you are looking at "employment" in a little different way. They weren't in it for the money.

Presiding Inspector: Next question.

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. Now, you said that Jack Shaw was one of the original group of longshoremen who took over this Waterfront Worker?

A. Yes; and very active.

Q. Very active? A. Yes.

Q. Did he run for office about that time?

A. What kind of office? [5818]

Q. Municipal office. A. I don't know.

Q. Huh? A. I don't remember.

Q. Did the Waterfront Worker support him in his campaign for city office?

A. I think if Jack Shaw run for any office we

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

who were running the Waterfront Worker would have supported him.

Q. Regardless of what ticket he was running on?

A. We would have supported him.

Q. If he ran on the Communist Party ticket would you have supported him?

A. We might not care what ticket he run on.

Q. Would you have supported him if he had run on the Communist Party ticket?

A. That is a theoretical question.

Q. And you don't want to answer a theoretical question?

A. It would depend on his program. If he was running for an open shop, the answer to that is "No." It would depend on what he run on. If he had been running on a program for short wages, or lesser wages, we wouldn't have supported him.

Q. Was John Shaw a member of the Communist Party?

A. I don't know. As far as I know he is not.

Q. Was John Schomaker?

A. I am not sure. [5819]

Q. Huh? A. I am not sure.

Q. What did you testify about that at the last hearing regarding John Schomaker, do you remember?

A. No. I don't have to check my testimony with my testimony at the last hearing, unless I was lying.

Q. Well, I don't know if you are lying—are you lying?

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

A. Well, it depends on who is going to judge that.

Q. Now, even now do you state that your best recollection is that you took this waterfront paper over in 1933 about October? A. Yes.

Q. That is the first issue?

A. It is not my best recollection. I am definitely sure of it.

Q. You are definitely sure of it?

A. Yes. The paper wasn't in existence in 1932 so it couldn't have been taken over then.

Q. Do you know Jack Bishop?

A. I had a recollection of a Bishop when you were asking me about the "Bishop," and I was trying to place him.

Q. That isn't the same "Bishop"—Roy Bishop. This is John Bishop.

A. When you started talking about the "Bishop" it reminded me of the name of Bishop and I am still trying to [5820] place him. I heard it somewhere and I connect it with the waterfront.

Q. Do you also connect it with the Waterfront Worker?

A. You mean as a member of, if he was a longshoreman—no, I don't.

Q. He was a longshoreman working on this same waterfront that you were working on all these years from 1923 up to the time you became an official of your union?

A. Well, he might have been. I don't recall him very well. I just have a faint impression of the



(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

name, and that I either know the name or I know him somehow; but I don't connect it in my mind with the Waterfront Worker.

Q. Did the Waterfront Worker support his candidacy for office in the San Francisco municipal elections in November, 1933?

A. I don't know. After all, I can't remember that.

Q. You had something to do with the publication of the Waterfront Worker in November, 1933, did you not?

A. I am pretty sure at that time we did.

Q. And if the Waterfront Worker did support Jack Bishop as a Communist Party candidate in the San Francisco municipal elections in November 1933 you would have had a hand in that, wouldn't you?

A. In what way?

Q. In getting the Waterfront Worker to support him, Jack Bishop, a Communist Party candidate? [5821]

A. Not necessarily; no. It depends. Somebody might have wrote a letter in and it would be printed, saying, "I believe that everybody ought to vote for those people." I don't know. It all depends on how it is done. Unless it is announced there by me, or not by me—it all depends on how it is done. If Bishop was a longshoreman—and I don't remember that he was—but if he was a longshoreman and was running for office, it is entirely logical that he

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

was supported by the Waterfront Worker. It would depend on his program, of course.

Q. Now, tell us just how you and the group of longshoremen took over the Waterfront Worker?

A. Well, we didn't exactly take it over. We started it up again.

Q. You must have done something. Where did you go, and who went?

A. Oh, as near as I can remember, here is what happened: First of all, the paper was coming out and there were many complaint raised against it; that it didn't talk the language of the men—

Q. (Interposing): This was before. Begin at the time that you and this group of longshoremen conceived the idea of taking over the Waterfront Worker. What did you do, where did you go, who did you meet?

A. That is what I am trying to tell you. [5822]

Q. Can you get that sequence?

A. Oh yes. I can tell the whole story.

Q. And try and follow it.

A. I will be able to follow it and tell you the whole story.

As I say, the paper went out of business. We were asking—

Q. (Interposing): Let me interrupt you right there if you don't mind. You said the paper went out of business. There was no publication for the month of October, no publication for the month of July, no publication for the month of June, 1933,

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

no publication for any time during the year 1933, is that what you are trying to tell us?

A. No, no, I am not saying that. I am saying that the paper went out of business, to the best of my knowledge, for a couple of months.

Q. Prior to the time you took it over, so there were no issues for September, then, 1933?

A. I don't think there was.

Q. There was no issue for August 1933?

A. You just showed me one.

Q. A couple of months—how many months are a couple of months?

A. Well, that is my best recollection. Now, it is pretty hard—you are sitting there with the issues. My [5823] best recollection is that there was no issue for a couple of months. I can be mistaken on that point after this length of time.

Q. Yes, I realize that. A. All right.

Q. I realize that you can be mistaken.

A. I will say the first issue we put out was in October, 1933. I don't believe there was an issue put out in September, 1933.

Q. Now, you are positive on that now?

A. As positive as my memory will allow me to be.

Q. Let us go back and try and answer the question that I have asked you. Do you remember the question?

A. I remember the question all right.

I will say that there was no paper published for a certain period of time anyway.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Q. Perhaps you have lost the question that I asked you.

Will you read the question, Mr. Reporter?

A. I can remember it very well.

We got the idea at that particular time that we needed some kind of a leaflet, or a paper, and we just decreed that we would take the name of the Waterfront Worker and put it out the same way.

Q. "We"—who do you mean by "we"?

A. Just a group on the waterfront. [5824]

Here is how we did it:—

Q. (Interposing) Just a moment—who did you get ahold of about this?

A. We got ahold of Harry Jackson and asked how he put out his paper.

Q. Where did you go to get hold of Harry Jackson?

A. Right on the waterfront.

Q. Right at this time that this group conceived the idea of getting, or taking over the Waterfront Worker?

A. Yes. He was on the waterfront every morning.

Q. He was there, and you and this group of longshoremen were there, and you talked to Harry Jackson about the Waterfront Worker?

A. Yes. We said, "What happened to the paper? Where did it go?"

Q. You said, "What happened" to Harry Jackson. What did he say?

A. He said it was not being published any more.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Q. Who said it was not being published?

A. Harry Jackson said it wasn't being published any more.

Q. He said that he wasn't publishing it any more? A. That is my best recollection.

Q. He said that. What did you next say?

[5825]

A. Well, we asked him how it was published. We hadn't given much attention to it up to that time.

Q. Did Harry Jackson tell you how it was published? A. Yes.

Q. What did he say?

A. That it was put out, mimeographed and put out.

Q. Did he tell you where it was being mimeographed? A. Yes.

Q. Where? A. I forget.

Q. You forget. Did he tell you by whom it was being published?

A. Our conversations, as far as I remember, were just along the line of how much money it would take. He told us it was simple; that all we needed was a mimeograph machine, and somebody to do the typing. So we went into the newspaper business.

Q. Didn't he, Jackson, tell you that he had a mimeograph machine? A. Yes.

Q. What did he say, suggest, about that?

A. I think he said it had broken down and

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

couldn't be used, or something. That was one of the contributing—

Q. (Interposing) Did he say it couldn't be repaired?

A. Something like that. That was one of the reasons [5826] the paper went out of business, among others.

Q. Was anything said at that time, while you were talking with Harry Jackson, about any money, about purchasing anything that belonged to the Waterfront Worker?

A. No. I remember we just went around and hit a few guys here and there for 50 cents, \$1.00, \$2.00, and rented a mimeograph machine.

Q. Let us stay there for just a moment. There was Harry Jackson, you, and this group of waterfront workers—you were talking with Harry Jackson about the Waterfront Worker?

A. Yes. That about ended it as far as Jackson was concerned.

Q. You asked him how you could get the Waterfront Worker? A. We didn't; no.

Q. Tell me everything that was said?

A. That is what I am trying to do if I get a chance.

Q. Give the conversation with Harry Jackson.

A. Jackson just told us how they had put out their paper. He told us what had happened to their paper. After he got through telling us how they had done it, and that their paper was finished, we didn't see any great difficulty as to why we



(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

couldn't do just as good, and maybe a lot better, and so we proceeded to do it. [5827]

Q. Did Harry Jackson offer his help and assistance?

A. I don't remember whether he did or not. I have an idea that is just the kind of thing he would say. I don't remember that we accepted it, or needed it.

You see, I should explain that up to this time we were putting out, this Committee of 500, were putting out printed leaflets on the waterfront, just one page leaflets.

For example, the meeting here (indicating) that you referred to—

Q. (Interposing) Now, you are going—

A. (Continuing) —we had a leaflet on this particular meeting you referred to.

Q. You are going into another matter.

A. No, I am not.

Q. I am still staying with the Waterfront Worker, and how you got it from Harry Jackson, what you said to him, and what he said to you, and everything else. Is that all that you can remember now?

A. I am on the same subject.

Instead of putting out a printed leaflet, we decided to borrow the name of the Waterfront Worker, and all we took over was the name.

Q. And Harry Jackson said, "Sure, you can

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

have the Waterfront Worker, and you don't have to give me anything for it," is that what he said?

[5828]

A. Yes, as far as I know. It wouldn't have done him much good to have said, "I want a lot for it." We just started the paper up, took the name.

Q. Were any arrangements made then there with Harry Jackson as to what the mailing address was to be of the Waterfront Worker?

A. Yes. I think that—if not then at some later date.

Q. Who discussed it with Harry Jackson?

A. We discussed it along this line—

Q. (Interposing) You said, "We". You mean you are including yourself and—

A. (Interposing) Some others, myself and others. I can't recall the others that were there. I can't recall specifically the other people, but I was there.

One of the things that we were concerned about was to keep our identity secret.

Q. You were talking to Jackson about this?

A. Yes.

Q. All right. What was said about the address of the Waterfront Worker?

A. Well, we continued to use it for a while.

Q. Did you ask Jackson, "Can I use, or can we use the same address that you have of the Waterfront Worker?"—Is that the way it happened?

A. Not that I recall. [5829]

(Testimony of Harry Benton Bridges.)

Q. What did happen regarding the use of the address?

A. I think we sent somebody up there, one fellow went up to see if we do it.

Q. "We sent"—who do you mean, you mean you sent someone?

A. I was one of the fellows talking it over.

Q. Who did you send? A. I don't recall.

Q. When did you send him with regard to this first conversation you had with Harry Jackson, regarding the Waterfront Worker?

A. At about that time.

Q. At about the same time, the same day?

A. I don't know that—around October 31.

Q. Did he return?

A. I don't specifically remember him returning, but it is a cinch he did.

Q. What arrangements were made with regard to using the address of the Waterfront Worker?

A. To continue having the address used as a mailing address.

Q. Do you recall—I am getting a little ahead of my story but I will come back again—when the Matson strike occurred?

A. When the Matson strike occurred? [5830]

Q. Yes.

A. That is at the time I am talking about—October '33.

Q. October '33? A. Yes, sir.

Q. Was the first issue of the Waterfront Work-

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

er the one that carried the story of the Matson Dock strike?

A. I am pretty sure it was; I am pretty sure that the first one we put out was a printed leaflet of the Waterfront Worker for special distribution up on Skid Row, a single page leaflet.

Q. Was this the first issue which you and this particular group put out?

A. I think it was. I might be wrong on it.

Q. After that did you put out a regular issue of the Waterfront Worker after the first issue?

A. I think we did; yes.

(Mr. Del Guercio passed an issue of the Waterfront Worker to Mr. Gladstein.)

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. Now, I will show you the September 15, 1933 issue of the Waterfront Worker, and on the masthead this is contained: "Issued by rank and file group in the I.L.A., Volume 110."

A. (Examining publication) That is one of ours. [5831]

Q. That is one of yours? A. Yes.

Q. So it wasn't September that you first took over the Waterfront Worker?

A. I think that is right.

Q. Huh? A. I think that is right.

Q. Not in October any more, is it?

A. No. I was fixing the date by the strike on the Matson Dock. You notice this (indicating) refers to the strike, except it (was in September instead of October.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Q. Mr. Bridges, is it possible that you again may be mistaken and that you now, after looking at this, and the others that I have shown you, say that you took over the Waterfront Worker earlier than even this date?

A. No. You notice this——

Q. (Interposing) Will you answer my question, please?

A. I say off-hand, my best judgment is, and from what I know, this was an issue put out by us.

Q. And you are sure you don't want to go back to your previous testimony in the earlier hearing and state that you took it over in 1932?

A. That is impossible. It wasn't in existence in 1932. Your first issue shows, Volume 1, No. 1, came out in January 1933.

Mr. Del Guercio: I offer this in evidence, if your Honor [5832] please, as Government's Exhibit next in order.

Presiding Inspector: It may be received.

Mr. Del Guercio: And with the request that we be permitted to withdraw it, have a photostat made, and substitute it for the original.

Presiding Inspector: Certainly.

(The publication referred to was received in evidence and marked Government's Exhibit No. 281.)

7

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

**GOVERNMENT'S EXHIBIT No. 281**

(Cut)—**WATERFRONT WORKER**

Issued by a rank and file group in the I. L. A.

**BLUE BOOK SMASHED ON MATSON**

**COMPANY BACKS DOWN**

**AS MEN DESTROY BOOKS**

The Blue Book is on the way out. On Thursday, Sept. 14th the stevedores working on the Matson Dock, decided amongst themselves that the B.B. had ruled them long enough. The result was that when called on to show their books, the men refused and walked off the dock 100%, and after a little discussion outside proceeded to tear up their B.B.s, and dump them in a pile on the sidewalk.

Imagine the feelings of Wicks and Red, who stood looking on from the upper windows of the dock.

Finally, after a conference by the B.B. officials and the Matson Co., Haskell came out and hired 3 gangs to go to work, and said, "Never mind the books". After that, hiring continued until (continued on page 3 column 1)

**NO RANK AND FILE GUARANTEE  
ON LOCAL N.R.A. CODE**

Everyone on the front is wondering what the NRA code for the longshoremen will be when it will be out. The code proposed by the I.L.A. "looks" very good; a \$1 an hour, and a 6 hour



(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Government's Exhibit No. 281—(Continued)

day—but what guarantee have we that this code will be accepted? And how will the wages look when inflation finally gets under way? Already prices are rising and the NRA proposes to force them further up.

As matters now stand, the Intern'l President, Ryan, will be our representative before the N. R. A. board. Ryan has a long history of cooperation with the shipowners and against the workers.

The code does not come back to the local for final approval, and no representative has been sent from S. F. In the three Eastern districts of the I.L.A., the Atlantic, Gulf, and Great Lakes, the proposed code has been even lower, 85c an hour and an 8 hour day. The local N.R.A. committee, composed of Creel, the ballyhooer for the (continued on page 3 Col 1)

### I. L. A. LONGSHOREMEN STRIKE IN BALTIMORE

Support Seamen On SS Diamond  
Cement; Wage Increase Won

Baltimore, Md.—Led by the fighting Marine Workers Industrial Union, the entire crew including officers, of the S. S. Diamond Cement, chartered to the Nelson Line declared a strike on August 18th, for the following demands: 1) \$ 10-increase in wages, 2) better food, 3) recognition of a ship's committee, 4) no one to be victimized, all strikers to be put back to work.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Government's Exhibit No. 281—(Continued)

Called by Captain Kjeldsen, the police came on board, arrested four of the crew, and put the rest ashore. A picket line was formed by the crew and the unemployed sea men of Baltimore, until a towboat finally came alongside and towed the Diamond Cement out into the bay.

Unable to obtain scabs, the agents finally appealed to the notorious scab-herding agency, the New York Seamen's Institute, who sent 21 men to Baltimore. Eighteen of these men finding upon arrival (continued on Page 3 Col. 2) ✓

## INDEPENDENT LONGSHOREMENS COMMITTEE

### Who And What Are They?

The leaflets that have appeared on the front lately and signed by the Independent Longshoremen's Committee, disclaim any connection to the employers, or the Blue Book. Why is it then, that only ones seen passing them out are Wicks and Red?

The last one issued right after the I.L.A. election, stressed the fact that the fighting talk delivered by Paddy Morris of Tacoma was to arouse the fighting spirit of the members. Well, at least, Paddy Morris saw the need of action on the B.B. or the I.L.A. is liable to die away. Then again, maybe he had been reading the Waterfront Worker which has been advocating the same thing for the last (con'd Page 2 Col 2)

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Government's Exhibit No. 281—(Continued)

Page 2

Waterfront Worker

Sept. 15, '33

## STRIKE NEWS

Aug. 22—Following the example of the fighting crew of the Diamond Cement, the crew of the S. S. Cornore of the Ore S. S. Co., went out on strike under the leadership of the Marine Workers Industrial Union for \$5 increase in wages, three watches, better sanitary conditions, and recognition of a ship's committee.

When representatives of the Marine Workers Industrial Union went on board the Cornore to confer with the ship's crew, they were threatened with arrest. This threat failed to materialize however, when the crew made militant demands that their chosen leaders be let alone.

Although efforts were made by scab-herding shipping masters to put scabs aboard, latest reports are that they were unable to do so. A twoboat captain publicly announced that neither he nor his crew would put any scabs aboard the Cornore.

Under the leadership of the M. W. I. U., the only organization leading the struggles for better conditions, That Stands For The Unity Of All Workers, Regardless Of Organization, The Fight Has Begun. Let us go forward in a united front of seamen and stevedores for higher wages and better conditions.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Government's Exhibit No. 281—(Continued)

**NOTHING CAN BE GAINED  
EXCEPT THRU STRUGGLE**

Despite the fact that the NRA is supposed to guarantee the workers the right to organize into the union of their own choosing, discrimination has been resorted to in many cases on the S.F. waterfront. The Waterfront Employers Association, thru their own union, the BB, have been firing men right and left from many different docks.

Excepting the actions already described on the front page of this paper, nothing else, that has been done by the ILA, the Labor Commission, or the NRA board, has succeeded in putting these victimized men back on the job.

Our policy is then clear. Never mind waiting for unfavorable decisions by any of the different boards. Let every longshoreman do his part, and see that the BB goes and that there is an end to all discrimination.

**"SMASH THE BLUE BOOK"**

**IN THE MAIL BAG**

Dear Editor:

After last Wednesday's meeting one thing should be clear to all stevedores—that waiting for law is not going to do us any good in getting rid of the Blue Book.

Curly Cutright's report showed us that we cannot get any action from the labor commission or

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Government's Exhibit No. 281—(Continued)  
the NRA board. It seems to me that Paddy Morris hit it on the head when he said, "Labor never gained anything thru law, but only thru organized action of labor."

At the meeting before this, he told us that no man should carry an I.L.A. card and Blue Book and that if he wanted to carry a B. B. he should turn in his I. L. A. card. I agree with this, too.

Now most of us know these things and want to be rid of the Blue Book, so why all the delay in our union getting busy with some organized action to smash the B.B.?

Waiting for a code to be signed and hoping our I.L.A. will be the recognized union instead of the BB, besides keeping us in suspense is giving the shipowners a chance to knock off our men, one by one, and we have not been able to do anything about it so far. There is one good way we can be sure the ILA will be recognized in the code and that our members will be protected, and that is, for us to smash the B.B. now.

Let's organize committees of our members on each dock to refuse to pay to the B.B. and to organize a walk out if we are knocked off.

A stevedore

## INDEPENDENT LONGSHOREMENS COMMITTEE

(continued from page 1)

ten months. "Do we want a fight?" they ask. And

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Government's Exhibit No. 281—(Continued)

we answer, "How're we going to avoid one? Are the shipowners going to give us what we demand without a fight?"

Maybe, but we have all yet to live to see it. We must be prepared to fight, and not expect to get wages and working conditions by just trusting to any labor leaders, here, or anywhere else.

They say the BB union has a large treasury, and is not likely to go out of business. Judging from the action of the gangs on Pier 39, and the Matson gangs walking out and tearing up their books, throwing them on a pile on the sidewalk, it looks as tho the B B will need their treasury to buy some books.

The only good piece of advice that we find in them is that the longshoremen don't allow themselves to be fooled by attorneys that may be hired to fool them, or by leaders who don't know how to lead but are only interested in what they get out of it.

Sept. 15, 1933      Waterfront Worker      Page 3

### BLUE BOOK SMASHED ON MATSON. MEN WIN

(continued from page 1)

enough men had been hired to work the ships, and not one man showed a Blue Books.

The foregoing, following the walkout on Pier 39 a short time ago, is clear cut proof that the long-



(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Government's Exhibit No. 281—(Continued)

shoremen on this waterfront are definitely thru with the B. B. .Don't let this action go unsupported.

All longshoremen must stand ready to back up the action taken by the gangs on these docks and to see that the I.L.A. also gives its full support.

I.L.A. delegates that were present at the time of the walkout, and who gave the longshoremen a great deal of unofficial support deserve credit. But, we might ask, why unofficial?

Red, Bryan and Wicks, when they left the docks after their conference with the Matson Company officials, were asked by some of the men, "Well, what are you going to do about it?"

They replied that they were going to stick with it, and for a moment, it looked as if they were in for a tough time, but they quickly jumped into their machines and beat it, followed by a great chorus of howls and boos.

#### NO RANK AND FILE GUARANTEE ON LOCAL N.R.A. CODE

(continued from page 1)

last war, Reichert, a rabbi, and O'Connell of the Central Labor Council of wellknown sellout fame, has handed down a decision that the Blue Book is not a company union. This means that as-far as the N.R.A. is concerned, they might deal with the B.B. unless we organize to smash it.

The code previously passed under the NRA show what a vicious attack on our living standards the

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Government's Exhibit No. 281—(Continued)  
employers have been able to force on us. For instance, the auto code, \$15 a week minimum, and the open shop.

The only way to better our conditions on the waterfront and smash the Blue Book, is to take matters into our own hands.

A) Dock committees should be formed on every dock to carry thru in an organized manner, the refusal to pay dues to the Blue Book.

B) We should insist that a rank and file representative be sent to Washington.

### **I.L.A. LONGSHOREMEN STRIKE IN BALTIMORE**

(continued from page 1)

that the ship was on strike, joined the picket line and supported the strike although the captain offered as high as \$75 for A.B.'s. The other three, detectives, and professional stoolpigeons, went aboard in a police launch.

Of extreme importance to the San Francisco stevedores is the fact that the Baltimore longshoremen—rank and file members of the International Longshoremen's Ass'n walked out in solid support of the seamen. Although the officials of the Baltimore I.L.A. attempted to get the Negro local to work the ship, all refused to do so.

The Diamond Cement was finally towed to Philadelphia, with a skeleton crew of six scabs, where she was met by another picket line, and was unable

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Government's Exhibit No. 281—(Continued)

to ship a crew. Later she went to New York and was greeted by M.W.I.U. pickets. Many of the unemployed seamen were so aroused they bombarded the ship with stones, rivetheads and brickbats. The wage increase has been won, but latest reports disclose that the strike will continue until the original crew is reinstated.

In a leaflet issued in Baltimore, the striking crew of the Diamond Cement say, "Longshoremen, we, thank you for your support. Your act of solidarity will help unite the seamen and longshoremen in all ports who will follow your example. . . . In the future, we pledge to do everything possible to mobilize the seamen for support of the struggles of the longshoremen."

### 900 BARGEMEN WIN STRIKE LED BY M. W. I. U.

St. Louis, Mo.,—Aug. 25th. Under the leadership of the Marine Workers Industrial Union, 900 Negro bargemen declared strike and walked out demanding a 48 hour week, an increase in wages, no work on Sunday, and recognition of the M.W.I.U.

Again the solidarity of the workers was displayed in that the longshoremen of East St. Louis and Cairo, Ill. gave full support to the strike.

The strike, which tied up the entire barge fleet, lasted for 11 days. The strikers won their demands for a 48 hour week, no Sunday work, recognition of the union and 7c per hour wage increase.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Government's Exhibit No. 281—(Continued)

Page 4      Waterfront Worker      Sept. 15, 1933

## THE SALES TAX

Always on the alert to stick another knife into the backs of the workers, our treacherous state officials, at the instigation of the big capitalists, have placed the burden of the state finances directly upon the workers, farmers and small businessmen of the state.

Deliberately vetoing a state income tax which would have forced the bankers and the big businessmen to carry this load, Gov. Rolph and the State Legislature, thru a neat bit of legal trickery, have forced thru the Sales Tax Act, and have even attempted to make it appear that the people themselves had voted for it.

The present drive of the NRA to legalize low wages and high prices, coupled with the Sales Tax, are an integral part of the vicious plan of Wall Street to force small businessmen out of their establishment and what is far worse, to so weaken the American working class by the lowering of the standard of living, that they will be unable to defend themselves against further attacks.

This tax, which is supposed to be  $2\frac{1}{2}\%$  tax on all sales, is so devised that it is in reality a 4 to 6% tax, due to the fact that most purchases of the workers are for small amounts, on which the tax is much higher than  $2\frac{1}{2}\%$  (for instance, when you pay 1c on a 15c purchase, you pay a 6.66% tax).

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Government's Exhibit No. 281—(Continued)

This acts as a direct wage cut when already wages are at starvation level.

The Retail Merchants Association headed by the Chamber of Commerce, have initiated a move for a referendum on the tax which has much support from small merchants. This is an attempt to fool the small businessman and workers into believing something is being done against the sales tax so they will not take the issue into their own hands and put up a real fight against it.

(continued in next column)

### STRIKE ON HAVANA FRONT

Havana, Cuba—4000 longshoremen went on strike in Havana and tied up the entire waterfront. After several days of militant struggle, during which even the Cuban women attacked scabs with stones and clubs, the shipowners granted the demands of the workers. A 10% increase in wages, a rotary system of employment, and recognition of the union were won.

### ORGANIZE. AGITATE! FIGHT!

This move is not only fake, and insincere, but is absolutely ineffectual. The tax bill is only designed to last two years, and it would take two years to repeal it by referendum.

In order to really defend ourselves against this and further onslaughts against our standards of living, we must make a real fight against this tax.



(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Government's Exhibit No. 281—(Continued)

To do this, we must cooperate with the Anti-Sales Tax Committee and refuse to pay the tax. We must boycott every store and business house who will not join us in our fight, and patronize only those who will.

When you go into the corner grocer to buy two bits worth of liver, or a loaf of bread, refuse to pay the pennies. If the merchant will not make the sale, explain to him the fake tactics of the Retail Merchants Association and urge him to join in the program of the Anti-Sales Tax Committee. If he refuses to do so, take your trade only to some merchant who will.

This is an issue which strikes home to all of us. We must throw off this terrific burden, maliciously forced on us by the bosses, and by a solid, united effort we can force a special session of the State Legislature to convene and repeal the sales tax.

### GRACE GETS HIS

The shooting of F. J. M. Grace, the retired shipowner, by his one time nurse, calls to our minds the time—about a year ago—when a gang loading lead on one of the Grace Line ships on Pier 46, was instructed by the walking boss that two tons to a load was required in order to make money for the company.

Well, those two tons damn near killed many a stevedore, but it only took one load with a hell of a lot less weight than two tons to finish Grace!



(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Government's Exhibit No. 281—(Continued)

**ACTION ON PIER #39**

When several stevedores were knocked off for not paying their B.B. dues, the rest of the men walked off with them. The next day the men were called back to work without the B.B!

[Endorsed]: Filed June 2, 1942.

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. Would you say that the word "Stevedore" never appeared in the Waterfront Worker after you and your group took it over? A. No.

Q. Huh?

A. No. That is, that the word "Stevedore" never appeared in the Waterfront Worker after we took it over?

Q. Yes. A. Ridiculous.

Q. When referring to longshoremen?

A. I wouldn't say that either. You can't refer to longshoremen, after all—

Q. (Interposing) Didn't you testify that one reason you didn't believe in taking the Waterfront Worker over was because of the appearance of the word "Stevedore"?

A. No—but it was used. You can read it yourself. [5833] I can explain it further if you like. But to refer to longshore work without using the word "Stevedore" somewhere—you read that ar-

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

article that you are looking at and see the difference between that and this. (Indicating.)

Q. Do you know what article I am looking at?

A. I looked at one article and I could see the difference immediately.

Q. You can do more than I can.

Now, let's go back to this address now. You sent somebody to see Jackson about using the same address?

A. No, we didn't. I never said that.

Q. What did you say?

A. I said somebody went up to the address to see if it was all right to continue using that address for a while.

Q. What was done?

A. What was done on what?

Q. Did he come back and report on that?

A. I don't remember that. But I presume he did.

Q. What address was used?

A. I forget—at least I didn't recall until I saw the Waterfront Workers in evidence here.

Q. What?

A. I know now. But I didn't remember. The first time that I brought it back to my mind was when I saw the Waterfront Workers introduced in evidence here. It was a Market [5834] Street Address.

Q. Is that the first address that the Waterfront Worker used after you and your group of long-shoremen took it over?

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

A. I think so. It will show on the copy.

Q. And that was 830 Market Street, room 421, is that correct? A. Possibly; yes.

Q. Possibly? A. That is right; correct.

Q. Do you know whose address that was at that time?

A. I think I do now. I had no recollection of it when the hearing started.

Q. Was Sam Diner at that address at that time? A. I don't know.

Q. Huh? A. I don't know.

Q. You heard Sam Diner testify?

A. Yes.

Q. What? A. Yes.

Q. You heard him testify that he had offices at 830 Market Street, that he occupied Room 421?

A. I heard him say that.

Q. Did you ever go up to this address at that time?

A. No. We kept away from those addresses, very far [5835] away.

Q. Now, tell me to whom the various articles that appeared in the Waterfront Worker, to whom they would be sent? A. To the address.

Q. And who was at that address to receive them?

A. Nobody; except they were just kept until somebody went up and collected them, and that was none of us.

Q. Who went up to collect them?

A. Oh, some seamen that we sent up there.

Q. Did you pay the seamen?

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

A. First, you have got to get the idea as to why we had such an address.

Q. I have the idea, and I wonder if you will be getting it pretty soon.

A. I have it too.

Q. This was your mailing address, 830 Market Street?

A. That is all; a mailing address.

Q. And articles that later appeared in the Waterfront Worker were submitted, sent to that address?

A. That is right.

Q. You, yourself, wrote articles for the paper?

A. Oh, sure.

Q. Did you send them to this address?

A. No. [5836]

Q. Where did you send your articles?

A. Sometimes I did and sometimes I didn't.

Q. When you didn't send them, your own articles, to 830 Market Street, Room 421, where did you send them?

A. I would give them to the fellow that was going to have them typed.

Q. Who was he?

A. I don't remember. I think it was—I don't remember. One of the fellows had a wife who was a typist, and she used to do the typing. I remember that.

Q. All right. Let's get away from the typist for a while and go back to the articles which you now say, that is, some of which you say you sent to 830 Market Street.

A. That is right.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Q. Then, what would you do, send somebody up there to get them? A. That is right.

Q. What? A. That is right.

Q. You mailed the article up there and then sent somebody up to get it?

A. Right. That is perfectly easy to understand if you know the picture. We used to do work out of town——

Q. (Interposing) There is no question pending, unless you want to make an explanation. [5837]

A. This is an explanation.

Q. Do you want to qualify your answer?

A. I don't want to qualify my answer, but I would like to add something to the answer.

Mr. Del Guercio: I submit it isn't a qualification of his answer.

Presiding Inspector: It will all come out later.

Mr. Del Guercio: I see it is getting close to four o'clock.

Presiding Inspector: I think we will go on. We have lost a good deal of time today. We will go on for about ten minutes.

(Whereupon Mr. Del Guercio conferred with the Presiding Inspector.)

Presiding Inspector: We will adjourn until Monday morning at ten o'clock.

(Whereupon, at 4:10 P. M. an adjournment was taken to Monday, June 2, 1941, at 10:00 A. M.) [5838]

Court Room 276,  
Federal Building,  
San Francisco, California  
June 2, 1941

Met, pursuant to adjournment, at 10:00 A.M.

[5839]

PROCEEDINGS

Presiding Inspector: You may go on, Mr. Del Guercio.

Mrs. King: If your Honor please, before any further examination I would like to call attention to two errors, I think, in the reporter's transcript which occurred on Thursday. One of them is on page 5798, the third line, where the date appears as "June, 1938" when the Bridges group took over the Waterfront Worker, and I have a clear recollection that it was January 1938—I mean, 1933. And that was the date of the first issue. It was January and not June, and that is my recollection.

Presiding Inspector: The first issue of the Daily Worker?

Mrs. King: Of the Waterfront Worker.

Presiding Inspector: Of the Waterfront Worker, I mean? The paper itself shows.

Mrs. King: Yes.

Presiding Inspector: It can't make and difference.

Mrs. King: I believe the transcript is incorrect.

Presiding Inspector: Is that in the testimony of Mr. Bridges?

Mrs. King: Yes.



Presiding Inspector: I don't recall anything about it.

What do you think about that, Mr. Del Guercio?

Mr. Del Guercio: I don't think there should be any [5840] change in the transcript at all. The transcript speaks for itself. We made a similar request not so long ago in connection with the spelling of the name "M-a-a-s" and "M-a-y-e-s". I also have a distinct recollection at that time that the witness had said "M-a-a-s".

Presiding Inspector: I can't remember, myself. I have no recollection. You had better let it stand.

Mr. Del Guercio: That can be brought out on redirect.

Presiding Inspector: Explain it in your brief.

Mrs. King: Then there is another one which I think maybe Mr. Del Guercio would consent to have changed because it is in one of his questions. As it reads now it doesn't make any sense, and it is on page 5832.

Presiding Inspector: Will you look at it? I don't want to see it.

Mrs. King: The third line, the question as it now stands in the transcript is as follows: "So it wasn't September that you first took over the Waterfront Worker?" My recollection was, "So it was in September," not "So it wasn't September." Now, I don't know.

Presiding Inspector: You will have to read the context, Mr. Del Guercio.

Mr. Del Guercio: We don't agree with that.

Mrs. King: All right.

Presiding Inspector: All right. Let it stand.

[5841]

Mr. Del Guercio: We will let the transcript stand.

Presiding Inspector: I have no recollection of it.

Mr. Gladstein: It can be corrected by the testimony on redirect.

### HARRY RENTON BRIDGES

called as a witness in his own behalf, having been previously duly sworn, testified further as follows:

#### Cross Examination (Resumed)

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. Now, you testified last Thursday that if Roy Hudson had made a speech during the 1934 strike, in connection with the 1934 strike, you would have known about it?

A. That is right, to any sizeable group.

Q. Now, you recall, don't you, that particular period during the 1934 strike when the discussions were had regarding the calling of a general strike?

A. I do.

Q. Are those events fresh in your mind?

A. Pretty clear.

Q. Now, who was it that first proposed the calling of a general strike?

A. The Joint Marine Strike Committee.

Q. And were you in favor of it? A. Yes.

Q. And was the Marine Workers Industrial Union in favor [5842] of it?

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

A. I think they were. They were not seated with us at that time.

Q. Did they make known to you, as Chairman of the Strike Committee, that they were in favor of calling a general strike?

A. I don't recall if they officially made it known, I am pretty sure they were in favor of it.

Q. How did they make it known to you?

A. I am trying to remember.

Q. Having in mind that Harry Jackson was at the head, or heading the Marine Workers Industrial Union at that time, can you now recall how it was made known to you?

A. Maybe not; maybe I can't recall specifically if they sent us a communication, but I am pretty sure they were in favor of it, and they supported it.

Q. Was Harry Jackson in favor of it?

A. I am sure he was.

Q. He talked to you about it, didn't he?

A. I am pretty sure he did.

Q. When did he talk to you about calling a general strike?

A. I can't recall that.

Q. But it was before the general strike was called?

A. Very definitely it was. [5843]

Q. Did you have meetings with Harry Jackson?

A. I can recall the Marine Workers Industrial Union presenting credentials to the General Strike Committee—

Q. (Interposing): I am not speaking about that. I am talking about the meetings discussions that you had with Harry Jackson with reference to call-

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

ing a general strike and with reference to the Marine Workers Industrial Union supporting such a general strike. You understand that?

A. I do.

Q. All right. Now, confine yourself with that.

A. I can't recall any specific conversation at this time on that matter.

Q. But you did have specific conversations, and you did have meetings with Harry Jackson, did you not?

A. It depends on what you call a meeting.

Q. What kind of meetings did you have with Harry Jackson?

A. Just prior to the general strike?

Q. Yes.

A. I don't recall any formal meeting.

Q. Where did you meet Harry Jackson to discuss the general strike and to discuss the Marine Workers Industrial Union's support of a general strike?

A. Oh, I guess we would meet Jackson most any place at that time. Jackson was around— [5844]

Q. (Interposing): I am not asking how you would meet him. I am asking where you met him.

A. I can't recall any specific meeting. I told you that. If you are asking me was there a formal meeting of some type, I don't recall any. If you are asking did I meet Jackson during the various strike activities and discussed all the strike questions with him, the answer is "Yes."

Q. Now, Jackson was talking to you and discuss-

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

ing these matters with you not as a trade union man, but as a member of the Communist Party, wasn't he?

A. No.

Q. Was he a trade union man?

A. As far as I know; yes.

Q. How far did you know?

A. I knew enough to know he was.

Q. What union was Harry Jackson a member of?

A. Marine Workers Industrial Union.

Q. Was he a worker?

A. As far as I know; yes.

Q. What was he working for?

A. For the strike at that time.

Q. He was working for the Communist Party, wasn't he? A. Not that I know of.

Q. You knew he was a member of the Communist Party?

A. I am not sure I did at that time; but even if he was [5845] he was still working for the strike.

Q. And he was working for the Communist Party?

A. He was working for the men on strike as far as I know.

Q. And you and Harry Jackson were working together, weren't you?

A. Well, in so far as the strike was concerned. I think that is correct.

Q. Now, this Roy Hudson, you say you knew all about every event leading up to the 1934 strike. You took an active part in it, didn't you?

A. I certainly did.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Q. You considered yourself one of the leaders of the 1934 strike, didn't you?

A. I had a little to *with*.

Q. Well, did you have more than anyone else—withdraw that. Would you say that you were the leader in the 1934 strike? A. The leader?

Q. Yes.

A. No, not particularly. [5846]

Q. Well, who was? Harry Jackson?

A. No, I don't think so.

Q. Roy Hudson? A. No.

Q. The Communist Party? A. No.

Q. Well, who was?

A. I would say the labor movement was and the various leaders and the officials of the labor movement. I can name them.

Q. You were a member of the ILA at that time, weren't you? A. Yes.

Q. Now, did the ILA call a conference prior to the calling of the general strike with regards to calling a general strike?

A. Yes. They had a meeting of various unions. They called a conference of unions in the Eagle's Hall, I think; either the ILA Committee or the Joint Marine Strike Committee.

Q. And who called that conference?

A. The Strike Committee.

Q. You were Chairman of the Strike Committee?

A. I was Chairman of both of them.

Q. And you called a conference to be held at the Eagle's Hall? [5847]



(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

A. Yes. The Strike Committee did.

Q. Well, you were on the Strike Committee? You were the Strike Committee, weren't you?

A. I was the Chairman of the Strike Committee.

Q. And you called a conference to be held at the Eagle's Hall?

A. The Strike Committee did, not me.

Q. Were you there at the conference?

A. I think I was.

Q. All right. You were at that conference?

A. If you have the same conference in mind as I have.

Q. I think we have. Now, you knew——

Presiding Inspector (Interposing): Just wait a minute, Mr. Del Guercio.

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. (Continuing): —that Roy Hudson, at least during the time of the 1934 strike, was general Secretary of the Marine Workers Industrial Union, didn't you?

A. Not that I remember I don't.

Q. Well, I will refresh your memory.

A. It is very fresh on that point.

Q. Well, it might be fresher after you read this. I have here a copy of the Western Worker for July 16, 1934 and there are several articles in this issue, one particularly appearing on page 1, column 3, headed "26 Locals want general [5848] strike, 1600 packed the hall, conference called by ILA wants immediate action to settle strike." Does that refresh your memory?

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

A. In regard to what?

Q. In regards to the matter of the 1934 strike and the calling of that conference.

A. I said I remember the conference.

Q. All right. Now, we will go further. The article reads: "An immediate general strike was the voice of delegates representing 26 local A. F. of L. Unions at a maritime conference called by the Maritime Strike Committee at Eagle's Hall". That is the same matter about which you have just testified, the calling of such a conference?

A. The same conference. I remember.

Q. To go further: "1600 workers took every available inch in the hall cheering and applauding as delegate after delegate announced his union 100 per cent for immediate strike action". You recall that?

A. Yes.

Q. That is correct, is it?

A. Yes.

Q. "The meeting was a preliminary conference to determine the sentiment"—"sentiment"—"of all workers toward a general strike. Delegates"—and I continue on page 5, column 4—"Delegates of 26 unions declared their overwhelming majority. One delegate expressed himself 'our men ready for instant action by union has voted 100 per cent [5849] for a general strike and we are ready right now. What we don't approve of is all this monkeying around. Let's go' ". Do you remember that?

A. I remember lots of statements something like that.

Q. "All labor leaders who oppose general strike

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

at this time', said a representative of the Teamsters' Union, 'are labor fakers and should be driven out of organized labor.' " That is correct, isn't it?

A. Well, there was something said like that.

Q. "His statement was received with thundering applause": Is that correct?

A. If I remember the meeting correctly, that would be about correct.

Q. "Representatives of all marine unions now on strike addressed a conference stressing the true situation on the waterfront as opposed to the false statements printed in all capitalist papers." Is that correct? A. I think so.

Q. "Delegates demanded a general strike for the protection of their own unions. 'This strike is no longer a matter of the waterfront alone', was the opinion voiced by almost every speaker. 'The armed attack of the bosses on the longshoremen threatens the existence of every union not only in S. F. but in the entire U.S.A.' " Is that correct?

A. I think that that was the general nature of many [5850] statements.

Q. "Members of the marine unions gave detailed descriptions of the ruthless police attack of last Thursday and of the cold-blooded murder of workers who were struggling for decent conditions." That is correct, isn't it? A. Yes.

Q. "Every man in the hall stood silent for one minute in honor of the dead." That is correct, isn't it? A. I think so.

Q. "All unions were requested to close their halls

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

for a period of two hours on Monday in respect of their fallen comrades." That is correct, isn't it?

A. Right.

Q. "It was also suggested that all comrades lay down their tools for one hour at one o'clock on Monday, which is the time of the funeral." That is correct, isn't it?

A. Right.

Q. "A representative of the Cannery and Agricultural Workers Industrial Union announced that his union had voted 100 per cent to support the general strike." Is that correct?

A. I guess so.

Q. All right. Now, I will read you another article in this same paper headed "Strike Ranks"—just a minute, please. Is that your picture appearing in this paper, Mr. Bridges?

A. Yes. [5851]

Q. That is yours?

A. Uh-huh (Affirmative).

Q. Now, immediately underneath it it reads "Strike Ranks Solid in All Coast Ports. Communist Central Committee calls for solidarity actions in all states. The 2000-mile strike front at a glance stood as follows on the ninth week: In San Francisco 2000 troops took control of the waterfront after battles which resulted in at least two dead and hundreds wounded". That is correct, isn't it?

A. Right.

Q. "The State Belt Line workers joined the strike." That is correct, isn't it?

A. No.

Q. That is not correct?

A. No, not entirely correct.

Q. "Cargo movements through police and mili-

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

tia convoys are insignificant as pickets stop all trucks".

A. More or less.

Q. That is correct?

A. More or less.

Q. "A conference of 26 locals was 100 per cent for a general strike. From indications the San Francisco Labor Council's efforts to head off the general strike will be overwhelmed by the sweep". Is that correct? A. Yes. [5852]

Q. Now, skipping several articles here in regard to the situation at San Pedro and Portland and in San Diego and in Seattle and reading on "From the East come reports that New York longshoremen are to consider a general sympathy strike unless Ryan can stop it. Ryan, International President of the longshoremen, who was kicked out of the situation here by the strikers, continues with his strike breaking efforts." Is that correct?

A. Very much so.

Q. "The Pacific Coast strike he says, 'can never be settled until employers refuse to recognize Harry Bridges and his Strike Committee' ". Is that correct. A. Yes.

Q. A quotation from Ryan?

A. Yes, he said worse things than that.

Q. "The Central Committee of the Communist Party has issued an appeal to workers in all parts of the country for immediate action in support of the West Coast strike with protests, solidarity actions in all ports and financial assistance." That is correct, isn't it?

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

A. I think so. We received contributions from all parts of the country.

Q. Now, "the appeal concludes with 'The strike can be won with the combined forces of workers. Protests against the bloody terror should swamp the U. S. and California Government offices.' " That is correct, isn't it? [5853]

A. Sure; that's how it was worded, too.

Q. "Financial support should be sent by unions and labor organizations to the Central Strike Committee and the Marine Workers Industrial Union". That is correct, isn't it? A. Yes.

Q. You were working in close cooperation with the Marine Workers Industrial Union at that time, weren't you, as this indicates?

A. That does not indicate. That indicates funds to be sent to two separate organizations, which was the facts at that time, —

Q. (Interposing): Now, I will continue.

A. (Continuing): —because they had been removed from the strike committee or were not speakers on our strike committee they had to establish their own separate set-up.

Q. And you were continuing to cooperate after they had been refused to be seated, didn't you.

A. In the way of funds?

Q. In every way? A. No.

Q. Didn't you continue to contact Harry Jackson?

A. That was—well, it was impossible to do otherwise. If you say, did I continue to talk to him and the



(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

two committees continue to work together on certain phases of the strike, absolutely yes.

Q. You did? [5854] A. Yes.

Q. Now, continuing on page 5 of the same article, column 8—

May I consult here a minute with Mr. Whitson?

(Whereupon Mr. Del Guercio conferred with Mr. Whitson.) [5855]

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. Now, continuing reading that article there in column 8, page 5:

“Solidarity actions in all ports, on the ships and docks and on the waterfronts, must be launched at once in support of the heroic West Coast Strikers.

“Demand that the terror against the longshoremen cease!

“Demand the right to strike and picket!

“Demand that the warship Holland be removed from the vicinity of the Frisco piers.

“Pacific Coast workers, answer the terror with a general strike!”

That is correct, isn't it, that is what the Marine Workers Industrial Union and the Communist Party were demanding at that time?

A. Maybe they were.

Q. And what you were demanding, in collaboration with them?

A. I don't understand all the demands—I don't remember any warship Holland.

Q. Do you want to read the article?

A. Yes; I would like to.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Q. Can you see that?

A. (Examining article referred to.): Yes.

Presiding Inspector: He has the original paper if you [5856] want to see it.

A. (Continuing): The only thing I don't recall is any demand about the warship being removed.

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. You recall the rest?

A. Yes. I think we had all those demands, the demand that terror cease, the demand to strike and picket and to support the general strike. All unions had those demands.

Q. Now, I will show you another article here on page 5 headed "Teamsters Vote General Strike, continued from page 1, column 7." That is the article I first showed you under your photograph headed "Strike Ranks Solid in all Coast Ports."

A. I thought under my photograph was "Communist Executive Council."

Q. Read that, and going down in the article under the heading "First Strike Breaking Action:

"The very first action of the Committee of Seven was a step toward strike-breaking."

What was the Committee of Seven?

A. The Committee of Seven was a Strike Strategy Committee—the Committee of Seven was from the San Francisco Labor Council.

Q. Were you on the Committee? A. No.

Q. That is one committee you weren't on, that is right..

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

A. That was a committee set up by the Labor Council. [5857]

Q. (Continuing): "They, in a meeting with the representatives of the striking unions demanded that the conference called to consider general strike action should not take any actual organized steps."

Is that correct?

A. Right.

Is that correct?

A. Right.

Q. (Continuing): "It was taking seriously the much advertised purpose of the 'Strategy Committee' as a step toward a general strike,"—

Is that correct?

A. That is right. We agreed with the Strategy Committee and went along with them.

Q. (Continuing): "... that the strike representatives agreed." A. That is right.

Q. (Continuing): "This is now clearly seen as a serious mistake, as the effect is only to delay action. The Committee will come before the Board with speeches while cargo is loaded protected by bayonets."

Is that correct?

A. At that time that was, I think, was the line advocated, and it is one of the times it wasn't followed, I guess.

Q. (Reading on):

"While the S. F. Labor Council was in session, a meeting of 1600 workers packed the Eagles' Hall to hear Roy Hudson"—[5858]

Does that refresh your memory?

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

A. On the meeting I am talking about, no.

Q. Does it refresh your memory?

A. I was in the Labor Council.

Q. You were in the Labor Council?

A. Apparently I was at every meeting of the Labor Council at that time.

Q. You are sure you weren't at this other meeting with Roy Hudson? A. I am positive.

Q. You can recollect clearly back to those events, back in 1934—how many years ago is that?

A. That is eight years ago; seven or eight years.

Q. You now recall clearly being in a labor council meeting while Roy Hudson was speaking at the Eagles' Hall?

A. I recall that any time that the Committee of Seven met I was around, because we were suspicious of them.

Q. Let me read on and maybe this will refresh your memory a little more.

"... Roy Hudson, General Secretary of the Marine Workers Industrial Union, and raised the roof with their applause for every mention for a general strike, and the unity of all unions involved in the strike."

Does that refresh your memory?

A. I don't think that refers to the meeting I am talking [5859] of.

Q. Roy Hudson was advocating a general strike at that time, wasn't he?

Q. Roy Hudson was the general secretary of the Marine Workers Industrial Union at that time, wasn't he? A. Apparently.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Q. You were working in close cooperation with the Marine Workers Industrial Union at that time, weren't you?

A. Up to a point. You are asking me about—

Q. (Interposing): I will continue to read the article—

A. (Interposing): I am kind of mixed up. What meeting do you mean?

Q. You know the meeting I mean.

A. I think I know. Do you mean the meeting called by the twenty-seven unions?

Q. I mean the meeting in Eagles' Hall in which Roy Hudson spoke.

A. That is a meeting called by the twenty-seven unions?

Q. What do you mean?

A. I am referring to that meeting. If you are referring to another, I don't know anything about another meeting.

Q. Have you a lapse of memory?

A. I have no lapse of memory.

Q. To continue reading: [5860]

"The majority of those present were strikers. Among the speakers were Henry Schmidt, of the ILA Strike Committee"—

You remember Henry Schmidt, don't you?

A. Yes; sure.

Q. A friend of yours? A. A very good one.

Q. Your pal? A. And how!

Q. And he was there. Now, to continue reading:

"... and Caves, of the International Seamen's Union rank and file."

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

You remember Caves?

A. Sure—Chairman of the Sailors' Strike Committee.

Q. (Continuing):

"The wife of Nick——"

A. (Interposing): Bordeau, the man that got shot during the strike.

Q. How do you pronounce it?

A. Bordeau.

Q. No, this is someone else—"Nick" Coundeora-kis"——

A. I don't know him.

Q. (Continuing):

"... member of the Communist Party, who was killed in front of the ILA hall, was on the platform."

Do you remember that now? [5861]

A. The only person I remember being killed at that time was Nick Bordeau. I thought you were going to refer to him.

Q. Maybe that is an alias for Nick Coundeorakis. Was Nick Bordeau a Greek?

A. Yes.

Q. And might have been the same person?

A. Possibly. Nick Bordeau was the only person I remember being killed down there at that time.

Q. And then in parenthesis at the end appears this: "(See Hudson's Speech elsewhere in this issue.)"

After seeing this Western Worker issue for Monday, July 16, 1934, and calling attention to Roy Hudson's speech there in San Francisco in the



(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Eagles' hall, and advocating a general strike, don't you want to change your testimony as to when you met Roy Hudson? A. No.

Q. Huh?

A. No. I don't recall meeting Roy Hudson during the Maritime Strike and the general strike.

Q. Now, you recognize the Western Worker as the Western organ of the Communist Party of the USA, Don't you? A. Yes.

Q. That isn't a fake copy, is it?

A. (Examining publication.) There is no mention of Hudson at the meeting I am referring to.

[5862]

Q. Try and refer to the same meeting I am referring to.

A. I don't recall that one. I think that if I check, or you check, you will find I was with the Strike Strategy Committee somewhere else.

Mr. Del Guercio: I offer this Western Worker in evidence as Government's Exhibit next in order.

Mr. Grossman: We object on the ground that no proper foundation has been laid. Otherwise, it seems to be an attempt to introduce as evidence the news story contained in the paper.

Mr. Del Guercio: The witness has identified the paper, the articles I read.

Mr. Grossman: Assuming Mr. Bridges said it looked like the Western Worker, that doesn't mean it is proper to introduce it as evidence because there is no evidence contained in that paper that is properly before this court.

(Testimony of Harry Reardon Bridges.):

Mr. Del Guercio: Let your expert examine it.

Presiding Inspector: Just a moment. This is a serious question. We have received a great deal of similar testimony, similar exhibits.

Your objection is that this is hearsay from an undisclosed source?

Mr. Grossman: Certainly. Even if a proper foundation is laid, which I doubt, it is incompetent, irrelevant and [5863] immaterial. I would like to know for what purpose it is introduced. If it is to prove the facts set out in the articles, it certainly is the kind of hearsay that is not admissible.

Presiding Inspector: I don't see that it is admissible, but only used to refresh his recollection.

It may be marked for identification.

I can't see how it is evidence otherwise.

Mr. Del Guercio: The Court will recall that the witness testified last Thursday that if anybody made a speech in 1934—

Presiding Inspector: This is no proof that anyone did make a speech. You will have to have something more than a mere newspaper account.

Mr. Gladstein: I recall the same question coming up during the cross examination of Mr. McCuiston, and your ruling was the same, that the newspaper article was not evidence.

Presiding Inspector: It may be marked for identification. The only value is as a source of refreshing his recollection. When his recollection is refreshed his testimony is the material part.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Mr. Del Guercio: This paper here also contains the text of Roy Hudson's speech.

Presiding Inspector: That is no proof of it unless—

Mr. Del Guercio (Interposing): And it contains a [5864] photograph of Roy Hudson.

Presiding Inspector: We can't try this on newspaper accounts.

I will allow it to be marked for identification.

(The publication referred to was thereupon marked for identification as Government's Exhibit No. 282.)

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. The same issue of the Western Worker, Government Exhibit 282 for identification, contains a full text of Roy Hudson's speech. Let me read you the last two paragraphs of that speech:

"Go ahead in the struggle for the establishment of a united front, build up a fighting organization in the course of the strike. Murders do not stop our struggle. Monday we will demonstrate that we will continue to fight that other workers have died for.

"Our ace in the hole—the ace in the hole of the working class—must be an answer to the bosses' attacks with a general strike. This must be done by the rank and file. Local after Local is going on record as being in favor of a general strike. Demonstrate at the Central Labor Council. Go forward to a rank and file

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

conference and make a decision for a general strike."

Do you now recall Roy Hudson's speech at Eagles' Hall on that day? [5865] A. No.

Q. You still don't?

A. No. If that had been an important instance I would have recalled it.

Q. On page 4 of the issue of the Western Worker appears a photograph of Roy Hudson. Do you recognize it?

A. (Examining photograph): Yes.

Q. That is a photograph of Roy Hudson?

A. Uh huh (affirmative).

Mr. Del Guercio: I offer this in evidence, if your Honor please, for the——

Mr. Grossman (Interposing): We will agree to the admission of the photograph, but not the document. That may be a ruse to get the whole paper in. We submit; by cutting out the picture, he can get the same effect.

Mr. Del Guercio: I don't want to destroy the picture, I mean the paper.

Presiding Inspector: Counsel concedes you may have the picture, but I don't think the picture aids in any way.

I will adhere to my ruling.

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. Now, you testified, also last Thursday, that the first mailing address of the Waterfront Worker, after you and your group of longshoremen took it

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

over, was 3470 Nineteenth Street, or Market Street—I gave the wrong number. I have another—

[5866] A. (Interposing): —821.

Q. 830 Market Street, room 421, is that correct? A. That is correct.

Q. Those rooms were occupied by the Needle Trades Union, were they not?

A. I think so. I am not quite sure.

Q. Of which Sam Diner was an official?

A. I think that is correct.

Q. And the Needle Trades Union was also a TUUL Union, was it not?

A. I believe that is so.

Q. How long did you continue to retain that address as the mailing address of the Western Worker—of the Waterfront Worker?

A. I don't remember exactly.

Q. But—what was the Waterfront Worker's next address?

A. 3470 Nineteenth Street.

Q. How did you happen to get that address as a mailing address of the Waterfront Worker?

A. I don't recall. I think that it was for the purpose of switching it around, and getting a new address, and in that way divorce it from the waterfront, from the MWIU group, and the other group that had been putting out the paper. [5867]

Q. And how was this brought about?

A. I can't recall exactly. I think one of the fellows connected with the Waterfront Worker—

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

as a matter of fact, hearing the testimony here and looking at the Exhibits, I believe the man who helped to rent the box was one of them. That's Mann. Herman Mann.

Q. What was that man's name?

A. Mann.

Presiding Inspector: Herman Mann.

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. M-a-n-n?

A. Yes. He was one of the original group. And, incidentally, I have thought of a few more that I can give you any time you want them.

Q. I told you to raise your hand. You remember a few more?

A. Yes.

Q. Mann was one.

A. Yes.

Q. Do you remember any more?

A. Michaelson; a man named Andy Thor; a man named Marshall Olsen; a couple more. For example, their nicknames, I recall a fellow we used to call "Mac". I can't think of the rest of the name. I have been trying to think it up, but that is all I can think of.

Q. Who contributed the most articles to the Waterfront [5868] Worker?

A. When? Right at the start?

Q. Throughout the whole period?

A. That would be hard to say. The contributions came in from numbers of people. That would be hard to say who contributed the most. The articles were contributed by dozens of men on the waterfront, either verbally or written.



(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Q. And how many articles did Harry Jackson contribute?

A. I don't know. I doubt whether he—it's possible he contributed some. I don't recall that. He mightn't have contributed any.

Q. How many did Sam Darcy contribute?

A. None.

Q. Huh? A. None.

Q. How many did Elaine Black contribute?

A. None so far as I remember.

Q. How many did Schneidermann contribute?

A. I don't think—Schneidermann wasn't even around then. He didn't come to San Francisco until, as far as I know—until 1936.

Q. The Waterfront Worker was not in existence then?

A. I think it had folded up before he come to San Francisco.

Q. Now, to go back to this address, 3470 19th Street, you say that's the next address after the one at 830 Market [5869] Street? A. Yes.

Q. With whom did you discuss the change of address of the Waterfront Worker?

A. I don't know.

Q. Did you talk about it with—did you talk to Harry Jackson?

A. I don't specifically remember that.

Q. Huh?

A. It's entirely possible I did.

Q. And why would you be talking to Harry

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)  
Jackson at that time regarding the moving of the address for the Waterfront Worker?

A. I thought I had explained that. Our purpose in having a mailing address was to pick up mail and it wasn't to be picked up by any of us. The place was being watched.

Q. And whose address was 3470 19th Street?

A. I don't know.

Q. Huh?

A. I don't know. We weren't concerned with that.

Q. And who obtained the service at that address, like the gas service and the electric service?

A. I didn't know that. I know now.

Q. You know now, don't you? A. Sure.

Q. You know now that it was Walter Lambert?

[5870]

A. According to the records you showed here. It was the first I knew of it.

Q. Had you met Walter Lambert at that time?

A. Yes.

Q. You knew who Walter Lambert was?

A. Oh, yes, yes.

Q. And who was he?

A. I forget his exact position, but I knew he was an official in the Communist Party.

Q. And for how long had he been an official in the Communist Party?

A. I don't know that.

Q. Huh? A. I don't know that.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Q. And when prior to the time he had applied for service at that address, 3470 19th Street, did you know Walter Lambert?

A. I met Lambert in the Labor Council in 1933 upon the occasion of a Cigar Makers' strike.

Q. 1933. And that's the first time you met him?

A. The first time I recall meeting him, yes.

Q. How many meetings did you have with Walter Lambert thereafter?

A. None.

Q. Huh? A. None. [5871]

Q. At any time?

A. Not that I recall.

Q. Was Walter Lambert connected with the Marine Workers Industrial Union?

A. Not that I remember.

Q. But you do know that he was connected as an official of the Communist Party?

A. Sure.

Q. How did it happen, if you know, how Walter Lambert applied for service at 3470 19th Street?

A. How do I know that?

Q. Yes.

A. I saw it here in this hearing.

Q. Can you explain that?

A. No. The first I knew of it.

Q. You can't explain it?

A. Can I explain how I knew? Is that the question?

Q. Why Walter Lambert applied for service at 3470 19th Street?

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

A. I don't know. Possibly because he wanted gas and lights, would be the most logical explanation.

Q. What did he want gas and lights for?

A. The same reason I would want them.

Q. What was that address at 3470 19th Street?

A. What was it? [5872]

Q. Yes. Was it a home?

A. I couldn't tell you. I was never there.

Q. You were never there? A. No.

Q. As a matter of fact, you know it was a hall, don't you?

A. Know it was what?

Q. A hall? A. I do not.

Q. Where was the—

A. (Interposing): As a matter of fact, I had the impression it was a home.

Q. Now, you saw this Government's Exhibit 219, didn't you? A. Yes.

Q. Application for service? A. Yes.

Q. At 3470 19th Street, made out by Walter Lambert? A. Yes.

Q. And you saw also that he stated that the premises there were occupied as "halls"?

A. I didn't. When I saw that Exhibit I got a brief look at it here when the lawyers were looking it over, and they gave it back to you. I would have liked to see more of it, but I didn't get a chance.

Q. And you saw on the back of it that Walter Lambert gave his occupation as at that time "manager, Workers Ex-Service Men's League". [5873]

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

A. You say did I see that?

Q. Yes.

A. I did not. I never had a chance to look the thing over. All I saw was that the bills were made out to Lambert. I didn't look any further.

Q. Now, there are two of these applications: One on 8/15/1933 and one on 8/12/1933 for services at this same address, 3470 19th Street. On the one for 8/15/1933 Walter Lambert states that the premises was occupied as halls. On the one for—is that correct?

A. (Examining Exhibit): In this application, yes.

Q. And on the second one it is stated that the premises were occupied as "assembly rooms". Is that correct?

A. That's what it says, yes.

Q. Now, having that in mind does it refresh your memory as to why you transferred the name and address of the Waterfront Worker from this address on Market Street to 3470 19th Street?

A. No. I think we transferred it for the reason to protect ourselves and remain unknown as the people putting out the paper, for the reasons I have stated.

Q. Now, was the Waterfront Worker mimeographed at 3470 19th Street? A. It was not.

Q. Where was it mimeographed? [5874]

A. It was mimeographed in one of the fellow's homes by his wife.

Q. What fellow's home?

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

A. I can't specifically remember that. I have been trying to.

Q. You can't remember that?

A. No. I don't know if it was—it was mimeographed at one of the fellow's homes. We rented a mimeograph machine.

Q. Who cut the stencils for the mimeograph machine?

A. One of the fellows whose wife was a stenographer.

Q. And you don't remember his name?

A. The same person. That's where the mimeograph machine was. That's where the typing was done.

Q. Was it John Schomaker?

A. I was thinking of Schomaker. I am not sure if it was or not.

Q. How long did you continue to retain that 3470 19th Street address as a mailing address for the Waterfront Worker?

A. I don't know. Not very long I don't think. I am not sure.

Q. Then what happened?

A. Well, I know we got a Post Office address. I have seen that by the Exhibits that were introduced here.

Q. Now, how did it come about that you transferred to a Post Office box this mailing address?

A. I can't remember that.

[5376]

Q. You mean you can't explain it?



(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

A. I think it is a difference. Those matters are not very important, and there would be nothing—

Q. (Interposing): You mean it is not important that you were using as an address for your Waterfront Worker an address occupied by a known Communist?

A. It wasn't as important—

Q. (Interposing): Not of importance to you?

A. Not as important to us at that time as possibly losing our jobs or getting run out of the city and thrown in jail or something.

Q. Did anybody discover why you were using this Walter Lambert's address?

A. Discover why we were?

Q. Yes, as the mailing address for the Waterfront Worker?

A. Did anybody discover why we were using that address?

Q. Yes?

A. I don't know what you mean by that.

Q. Well, why did you change the mailing address from Walter Lambert's premises?

A. I don't know.

Q. Huh? [5877] A. I don't know.

Q. Would there be any reason for changing it?

A. Possibly was.

Q. And you don't know what the reason was?

A. No. Maybe, look in the paper. If you have got a copy of it, look in the paper. It might tell you.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Q. Did you get orders from Sam Darey to change it?

A. Never had orders from Darey in my life.

Q. Did you get orders from Harry Jackson to change it?

A. Never had orders from Harry Jackson in my life.

Q. Whom did you get orders from to change the address of the Waterfront Worker?

A. From no one. We were able to do a pretty efficient job all by ourselves.

Q. And you don't know why you changed the address?

A. No, not off-hand. Can't remember why we changed the address. It wasn't important.

Q. It wasn't important to whom?

A. No. To us.

Q. And who went up to rent the Post Office box?

A. I don't know.

Q. How did it happen?

A. I don't know that either.

Q. Huh?

A. I am telling you that it wasn't important. It [5878] didn't make a good enough impression upon me at that time.

Q. But it does make an impression on you to know that Harry Jackson went up to rent the Post Office box for your Waterfront Worker?

A. I know that.

Q. You know that?

A. In testimony here.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Q. What kind of an impression does that make upon you?

A. Not a very——

Q. (Interposing): Not a very good one?

A. (Continuing): ——important one, no.

Q. Do you know any reason why Harry Jackson should go up and hire and rent a Post Office box for your Waterfront Worker?

A. I can think of the reason. If you want to know the reason I will tell you.

Q. I want the truth.

A. That is all you are getting.

Q. The real reason. What was the real reason for Harry Jackson going up to rent a Post Office box for your Waterfront Worker?

A. Jackson was known—Jackson was out in the open. They couldn't do any more to Jackson than they had already done.

Q. What do you mean "Jackson was out in the open"? [5879] Do you mean that everybody knew that he was a Communist?

A. No.

Q. What do you mean?

A. Everybody knew he was trying to organize.

Q. Organize what? A. The workers.

Q. On what? A. On the waterfront.

Q. In what union?

A. In the M. W. I. U.

Q. And in the Communist Party?

A. I wouldn't call that a union.

Q. No, I wouldn't either.

A. We agree on that then.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Q. Was he soliciting members for the Communist Party also?

A. I am sure he was.

Q. Huh? A. Yes, sure.

Q. And you were working with Harry Jackson? A. In some respects.

Q. Can you give us a reason here?

A. Yes.

Q. Why you were using Harry Jackson at that time to change these various addresses for your Waterfront Worker?

A. Yes. Now, listen to me when I give it. [5880]

Q. Yes. I will be glad to listen to your story.

A. I have already told you what the paper was for. The paper was to bring the attention of the various people in the waterfront and in sympathy with the waterfront to the conditions that prevailed on the waterfront. The paper was also a means of the men on the waterfront, for the men being able to express themselves without coming out in the open. The things that they were able to say through the Waterfront Worker, if they had said them openly they would have been blacklisted out of the industry. Therefore, that was the main reason the paper was anonymous.

Q. Now, you haven't mentioned a single reason why Harry Jackson was connected with the Waterfront Worker.

A. I am giving the reasons. You don't understand them, but I am giving the reasons. Now, we had to get an address, a mailing address where

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

these written complaints could be mailed in. We also knew that there was quite an effort afoot through the city agencies, through the employers' own agencies and their own people to discover the people behind the Waterfront Worker. They had a couple of nice little slugging squads around there, too, also trying to find out who was behind it.

Q. Did you ever get slugged?

A. Well, in more ways than one, yes.

Q. Go on. Continue.

A. That's always part of the game [5881]

Presiding Inspector: Let him finish his answer.

A. (Continuing) And, therefore, the thing to do was to pick out somebody who was already known, and if they were watching the place that was selected for a mailing address and they found that this person was going up there to rent it or to collect the mail or anything like that, and it was somebody already known to them, somebody they had already discriminated against as much as possible, it didn't hurt us, the real people behind the paper. So it was merely for the protection against the employers and the employer agencies that were at work to protect the people who were trying to bring out the bad conditions on the waterfront. And that was the only reason, no other one.

Q. Now, will you tell me why you used Harry Jackson to change the addresses?

A. Because—I thought I had said that.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Q. That is your reason?

A. Jackson was so much out in the open. They had done about everything they could to Jackson. They couldn't do any more, even if they found out he was the whole brains behind the Waterfront Worker, which was not so.

Q. Is this correct? You went to Harry Jackson and said "Will you please change the Waterfront Worker's address for us? We don't want to continue it at the first address there on Market Street. We want another address". Is that [5882] correct?

A. I am not sure that that is entirely correct.

Q. What happened?

A. I don't know if I went to him, but this is what is correct: —

Q. (Interposing) With regards to the changing of the address.

A. Harry Jackson was requested by the people who were concerned with the Waterfront Worker to change the address or establish an address to have the various letters and complaints mailed into, yes.

Q. And you say that Harry Jackson was out in the open so you used Harry Jackson?

A. That's right.

Q. Well, then can you tell me why Harry Jackson had to use an alias in getting that Post Office box?

A. No.

Q. Or can you explain that?

A. No.



(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Q. But you know he did rent the box under an alias, don't you? A. I don't. Did he?

Q. You have heard the testimony here in Court. You have heard the name of Harry Glickshon, haven't you? A. Yes.

Q. And you have heard it testified that Harry Glickshon [5883] was Harry Jackson's alias?

A. I might have heard things testified to here. You are asking me what I know and what I believe.

Q. You have seen this Government's Exhibit 212, haven't you, application to rent a box in the Post Office; haven't you? A. I saw that.

Q. Well, look at it again. A. Yes.

Q. Do you see the name of "Harry Glickson"?

A. Yes.

Q. And he rented what box?

A. 1185. Our box.

Q. That is the Post Office box for your Water-front Worker? A. That's right.

Q. So Harry Jackson came out in the open or was out in the open and because of that you used him to rent the Post Office box for your Water-front Worker under an alias, is that correct?

A. That is not correct.

Q. Well now, who suggested—

A. (Interposing) As far as I know, the testimony I have heard here is that his correct name is Glickshon, the name he used on the box is correct.

Q. Was he known as Harry Glickshon? [5884]

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

A. Not to us he wasn't. He was known as Jackson.

Q. That is the only name you knew him under?

A. That's all.

Q. And is that the only name he was known to by others?

A. As far as I know, yes. He was known to us under an alias. He used his true name to rent the box, apparently.

Q. And how long did you continue to use that Post Office box as the address of the Waterfront Worker?

A. I don't recall that specifically either. I don't recall whether we changed or kept the same box all the time.

Q. Who paid the rental for the box?

A. The Waterfront Worker.

Q. The Waterfront Worker. Did it go up to the Post Office and pay it?

A. Yes.

Q. Huh?

A. I presume so. I don't recall a detail like that.

Q. Who went up to the Post Office to pay it?

A. I don't remember.

Q. Well, as a matter of fact, you know that Jackson paid it, didn't you?

A. You mean continuously? I know that that would be impossible.

Q. That would be impossible. Why would it be impossible [5885] for Harry Glickshon or Harry Jackson to pay for the box?

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

A. Because he was not there after a certain time. Glickshon left the city.

Q. When did he leave the city?

A. I think it was towards the end of 1935 or the middle of 1935 after the M. W. I. U. dissolved. He went to Seattle.

Q. He went to Seattle? A. Yes.

Q. And he remained up there?

A. Sure! So he couldn't pay the rent.

Q. So that up to the time he went to Seattle would he be paying the rent?

A. I am not at all familiar with how it was done. I don't know whether it would be paid by mailing the money in or by sending a check in or anything else.

Q. Who paid the original deposit for the box?

A. I believe it was Jackson, according to the records there.

Q. Well, was it his own money?

A. No. I think that it was given to him by us.

Q. You are sure of that?

A. I have a very definite recollection of when we took over the paper and started it up again all the expenses were met by us. [5886]

Q. You gave the money to Jackson?

A. For that purpose, yes.

Q. Where did you see Jackson to give him the money for that purpose?

A. I don't recall anything like that.

Q. Did you give him the money?

A. I don't recall that. I might have.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Q. You said you recall definitely the incident.

A. I did not. I said I definitely recall that we assumed all expenses. But when you start asking me about details, who done this, that and the other I don't remember.

Q. Yes, so I notice. Now, how much money did you give Harry Jackson for the rental of the box?

A. I don't know. We gave him enough.

Q. When you say "we" you mean yourself and others?

A. Every time I say "we" I refer to everybody that was connected with the Waterfront Worker at that time.

Q. And who was connected with the Waterfront Worker at the time you gave this money to Jackson?

A. The ones that I recall I have told you.

Q. You can't recall any others?

A. Well, you asked me originally for the names of the bunch that got together first. Now, if you want to have me recall everybody that was connected with the Waterfront Worker, why, that would amount to hundreds and it would be almost im- [5887] possible for me to do it.

Q. Now, did you have a discussion with Harry Jackson at the time this money was given to him?

A. I don't recall that.

Q. And where did you give the money to him? Did you go to his home or did you go to the headquarters of the Communist Party to see Jackson?

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

A. None of those things were necessary. Most of those transactions were carried on, as I say, just by standing on the waterfront on the sidewalk.

Q. You mean you carried on a transaction of this nature, of changing the address of the box of the Waterfront Worker, out in the street?

A. That is practically the way the whole thing functioned. Even the union functioned that way for quite a few months.

Q. You didn't go up to see Harry Jackson at the Communist Party?

A. It was not necessary.

Q. It was not necessary? A. No.

Q. And your testimony is now that Harry Jackson may have continued to pay the rental of that box up until the time he left for Seattle in the middle of 1935?

A. No, it is not. That is not my testimony. My [5888] testimony is that I don't remember whether that happened or not.

Q. Do you know if you paid for it?

A. If I went up and paid the actual money in?

Q. Yes.

A. No. I'm sure none of our group did.

Q. None of your group did?

A. Not that I remember.

Q. So then it is possible for Harry Jackson to have paid it?

A. Oh, wait a minute! Not necessary.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Q. Who else would have paid it?

A. We might have sent up one of the fellows that would have peddled the paper. I am sure of this: We would send up somebody who couldn't be taken any steps against in so far as his job on the waterfront was concerned. Now, we were not foolish. We knew that they were watching for who as behind the paper and we knew that they were watching the mailing address, and anybody who went up to collect the mail was somebody they couldn't make any move against on the waterfront, generally speaking anyhow.

Q. They didn't follow the one that picked up the mail, did they?

A. Did they? Oh, I'm sure they did. [5889]

Q. Well, how did he get the mail to you after he picked it up? . . . A. It never did come to me.

Q. Whom did it go to? To Jackson?

A. No. The mail could be opened up and then turned over to one of us on the waterfront.

Q. Who would do that? The same fellow who went up to get the mail?

A. That was all, sure.

Q. Where did he open it up?

A. He brought it right down to the waterfront. It could be opened up there.

Q. Right in the street?

A. Sometimes, sure.

Q. Would you be there when he opened up the mail? . . . A. Sometimes, yes.

Q. The times you were there he would go up



(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

to this Post Office box or these other addresses, go up and get the mail and bring it down to where you were gathered out in the street and open it up there?

A. We might be sitting in a restaurant on the waterfront or sitting in a saloon somewhere.

Q. And he couldn't have been followed while he was doing that? A. Sure, he could. [5890]

Q. Was he followed? A. Plenty of times.

Q. Huh? A. Plenty of times.

Q. Were you ever caught with the fellow who got the mail from these various addresses?

A. Undoubtedly they saw us talking to the man who collected the mail.

Q. And what happened? A. Nothing.

Q. Did anything happen? A. Nothing.

Q. Were you exposed?

A. No. By that time we were getting pretty strong on the waterfront and it reached the point where it was—

Q. (Interposing) I am talking about 1934 and '33, the latter part of '33 and 1934, the time you had this Post Office box.

A. Oh. About four or five months after we took the paper over we weren't particularly worried any more.

Q. So there was no necessity, then, for getting anybody to rent a Post Office box for you in 1934?

A. No; a few months after we took the paper over the Union was pretty well organized and we

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

didn't have to worry so much about being discriminated. [5891].

Q. Oh. Then, you want to change your testimony and say that that was not the reason why Harry Jackson rented the box?

A. No. I still say that. You are talking about the initial renting of the box.

Q. Which was on February 7, 1934.

A. All right. And a couple of months after February of 1934 we weren't particularly worried about any discrimination. We were beginning to get our feet on the ground then.

Q. Now, you continued to use that box, did you not, until the Waterfront Worker discontinued?

A. I am not sure about that. Possibly. There might have been another change.

Q. Did you have any other mailing address for the Waterfront Worker? A. What?

Q. Did you have any other mailing address for the Waterfront Worker?

A. I don't remember.

Q. Huh? A. Not that I remember.

Q. Now, to go back to this mimeograph machine, you say you and a group of longshoremen purchased it? A. Later on.

Q. When did you purchase it? [5892]

A. Oh, I can't remember that. We rented the first one and later on we made an appeal—

Q. (Interposing) You rented the first one?

A. Yes.

Q. From whom?

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

A. Oh, I forget. Some firm in the city.

Q. You rented a mimeograph machine?

A. Yes.

Q. How long did you rent it for?

A. Five or six months or so.

Q. And you don't remember the name of the firm?

Presiding Inspector: He said that.

A. There are a lot of firms who do business like that.

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. Where was the mimeograph machine taken that was rented?

A. Where was it rented from?

Q. Where was it taken?

A. It was taken to one of the fellow's homes, the fellow whose wife typed the stencils.

Q. And later on you purchased a mimeograph machine?

A. Yes. We put on a drive through the pages of the paper and asked that donations be sent in. We printed a weekly itemized statement of expenditures and we put on a subscription drive and a donation drive. [5893]

Q. And you purchased this mimeograph machine?

A. Yes, and got together \$500 through such a set-up and purchased the machine outright.

Q. From whom did you purchase the mimeograph machine? A. I forget that, too.

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Q. From the same company?

A. I am not sure.

Q. Was it a San Francisco firm?

A. Yes.

Q. Local? A. Yes.

Q. You are sure you didn't rent it and purchase it from the Communist Party?

A. Gee! I didn't know they were in business selling machines.

Q. Did they have a mimeograph machine?

A. The Communist Party?

Q. Yes.

A. I am sure that they have plenty of them.

Q. You didn't get one of those? A. No.

Q. Huh?

A. No. We bought our own machine brand new from some stationary firm.

Q. Did you retain a bill of sale, if there was any? [5894]

A. Possibly for a while. A lot of these items you are talking to me about was something that we didn't pay a great deal of attention to. Maybe in an efficient business office you would. This wasn't that efficient type of set-up and bill of sale for the ink and machine and things like that I don't remember and I don't know where they went. They were paid, that's all.

Q. At any time while you were putting out this Waterfront Worker did you support or the Waterfront Worker support a slate, a Communist slate of candidates for the municipal elections in San Francisco?

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

A. I don't remember that. It's possible. Maybe we did and maybe we didn't, or we might have supported certain individuals who were running for office. I recall they used to always be campaigning on the waterfront of all different types and characters.

Q. Now, who would ask you to give support to any particular candidate running for office?

A. The candidates themselves. They were down on the waterfront constantly asking us for support. Everybody was soap-boxing.

Q. Did Jack Bishop ever run for office in San Francisco?

A. I don't specifically recall. My memory of Bishop is pretty hazy. I think he was a longshoreman. I am not even [5895] sure of that.

Q. You are sure that he was a member of the Communist Party?

A. I am not even sure of that. I never said that.

Q. John Diaz.

A. Who?

Q. John Diaz.

A. That name makes an impression on me. I can't place him off-hand.

Q. Ed Harris?

A. Ed Harris. I know Ed Harris.

Q. You know him to be a member of the Communist Party?

A. I know him to be a member of the Machinists' Union.

Q. What?

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Q. I know him to be a member of the Machinists' Union.

Q. Do you know him to be a member of the Communist Party? A. No.

Q. Louise Todd?

A. Louise Todd was one of the people in the Cotton strike in '33.

Q. A member of the Communist Party?

A. Somehow or other I know she is now. I am not sure about that time.

Q. James Tracy? [5896]

A. I know Tracy.

Q. A member of the Communist Party?

A. No, a member of the Machinists' Union.

Q. And did the people that I mentioned run for Supervisors in 1934 in San Francisco?

A. I don't know. They might have.

Q. Neil Hickey? A. I don't know him.

Q. Ran for Treasurer?

A. I don't recall him.

Q. Now, you knew that these people that I have mentioned—Bishop, Diaz, Harris, Todd, James Tracy and Neil Hickey—were advertised as the Communist slate?

A. Not particularly. I don't recall that.

Q. Well, for the purpose of refreshing your memory I will show you an issue of the Water-front Worker for October 18, 1933 and call your attention to an article appearing on page 2 under the heading "Vote for Whom?" I am reading now the Western Worker, looking—



(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Do you want to see this?

Mr. Gladstein: We will look at the copy while you read the original, or vice versa.

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. "The Waterfront Worker in looking over the 30 can- [5897] didates and their platforms for the coming elections, recommends to all longshoremen to vote for the six Working Class Candidates".

Mr. Gladstein: What page did you say this was on?

Mr. Del Guercio: Page 2 second column.

By Mr. Del Guercio:

Q. "Some candidates want votes because they were born somewhere in S. F. or other, some because they belong to some order or other, others promise economy, but at who's expense they don't say.

"We can all agree with the platform of the six Working Class Candidates \* \* \* Cash Relief—Abolition of the Vagrancy Laws—No Evictions—Gas, Water and Electricity for the Unemployed—Unemployed Relief at the Expense of the Rich Taxpayer.

"Vote for Jack Bishop, John Diaz, Ed Harris, Louise Todd & James Tracy for Supervisors. Neil Hickey for Treasurer".

Did you write that article?

A. Sounds very much not like what I wrote but it sounds very much like an article that the Waterfront Worker would support.

Q. And does that refresh your memory now?

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

A. Meaning would I agree with that?

Q. Yes.

A. Oh, yes. I agree with it. [5898]

Q. And did you support those candidates as indicated by this article?

A. Possibly. I don't recall what candidates were running against them, but they certainly must have looked the best to us, and if it is in the paper I supported it, yes.

Q. Well, it is in the paper, isn't it?

A. Well, you read it. Better let me see it.

Q. Well, you look at it.

A. (Examining Exhibit) Yes. The article is here and undoubtedly that was the position of the paper in supporting them.

Q. Then you did support at that time those candidates for office, is that your testimony?

A. Yes.

Q. Did anyone ask you to give your support to them?

A. Only in the way that it is set forth in the paper, as I said: That all the candidates for office at that time were on the waterfront requesting support.

Q. Did they ask you for your support?

A. I don't remember that specifically or whether any of them specifically asked me.

Q. Did Harry Jackson ask you to support them? A. No.

Q. Did Sam Darcy ask you to support them?

A. I have told you how it was done. [5899]

(Testimony of Harry Renton Bridges.)

Q. Well, how was it done? Maybe I misunderstood you.

A. All the candidates for office at that time were on the waterfront, the various—of all political denominations, urging that the men on the waterfront vote to support them. There was a specific reason for it. You could go down to the waterfront every morning at seven o'clock and you could speak to upwards of three or four thousand men. That's why they were all down there. Mayor Rossi, all the Supervisors, all the candidates for those offices, the Socialist candidate, the Progressive candidate and the Communist Party candidate, they were all down there. We picked out what we thought was the best of the bunch and supported them.

Q. You picked out, did you not, the Communist Party candidates?

A. Not necessarily. I don't know that.

Q. You don't know that?

A. We picked out all the trade unionists apparently.

Q. Let me refresh your memory.

A. What?

Mr. Del Guercio: I offer this Waterfront Worker in evidence, your Honor, and ask that a photostatic copy be substituted.

Presiding Inspector: There is no objection to that. It may be received.

(The paper referred to was received in evidence and marked Government's Exhibit No. 283.) [5900]